

27 Industry

'Those abused girls in Rotherham just need to shut their mouths. For the good of diversity'. (Spoof tweet 'liked' by Naz Shah, Labour MP for Bradford West and as of October 2021, Labour Shadow Minister for Community Cohesion [sic].)

Until the Reformation, the power of the Church in English affairs was such that, with the backing of Rome, it was able to secure immunity for its clergy from prosecution in secular courts, the so-called 'Benefit of Clergy'. Even if the crime were one of murder or rape (which it frequently was) the cleric in question could only be tried in an ecclesiastical court, under Cannon Law, with the inevitable and intended result that acquittals came easy and punishments, when imposed, usually involved only an act of penance. Such church immunity from English laws was, from very early on, rightly seen as a challenge to the power of the crown and other secular interests, and was progressively eroded, beginning with Henry II's 'Constitutions of Clarendon' of 1164 and, after further radical limitations by Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, finally abolished by Parliament in 1827. In a quirk of history, Henry II's first attempt to establish a single, unified system of law 'common' to the entire realm (hence 'Common Law') was challenged by one of Sharia law advocate Rowan Williams' predecessors, Thomas a Becket, who paid for his defence of what was termed the 'criminous clergy' by his so-called (by T.S. Eliot) 'Murder in the Cathedral' in 1170.

By its current policy of protecting clergy who, from time immemorial, have been routinely raping children of both sexes as well as women, the Roman Catholic Church is still living, or rather trying to, in those times when Benefit of Clergy would indeed have ensured that rapists, whether of children or adults, escaped prosecution in secular courts. That this still happens today is not the fault of the law, but of a church that still tries by every possible means to defy and evade it, and what is more, sometimes does so with the connivance of the civil powers that should be enforcing it. But even here, a distinction must be made between its 'criminous clergy' and the claims of Islam. Even at the height of its powers and legal immunities, except in the Papal States of central Italy, the Catholic Church never demanded that the Catholic *laity* be subject only to ecclesiastical law and courts. It was applicable only to those in holy orders. So far as offences committed by its laity were concerned the Catholic Church was obliged to 'render unto Caesar'.

The situation of pre-emancipation Jews was obviously very different. Jews living in Christian and Islamic states, and therefore subject to any number of punitive and discriminatory laws, were consequently, unlike the Christian Churches, never in a position to demand special legal privileges for their clergy, let alone ones for their laity. Unlike diaspora Muslims, instead of insisting on the right to be ruled by the laws of Moses, they always demanded the right to be treated as equals under the law of the land. This was first achieved in Europe by the French Revolution, (inspired, so the Hamas Covenant informs us, by world Zionism) when its National Assembly enacted the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of August 26, 1789, abolishing as it did so at a stroke all legal

restrictions imposed on the Jews by the Catholic Church and the Bourbon Monarchy. This demand of the Jews for equality before the law was effected in two Articles: Article 1: 'Men are born free and remain equal in rights', and in Article 10: 'No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views'. In these few words, a thousand years and more of pitiless legal and clerical persecution and segregation were undone. It is, of course, impossible to legislate out of existence the prejudices of those reared on such deeply ingrained bigotry, as the Labour Party's anti-Semitic scandal has once again demonstrated. Northern Ireland and the Balkans are also sad testimony of this fact. But the French and American Revolutions proved it is possible to deny them a voice in the laws of the land, enabling the Jews, despite their remaining the accursed of Christianity and Islam, to take their first step along the often-t tortuous path of genuine emancipation. Perhaps this helps to explain why Hamas decries the French Revolution as the work of a Zionist conspiracy.

Unlike the majority of diaspora Muslims today, not even the most influential Christian Churches, and certainly not Jews, Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Zoroastrians or followers of any other religion save Islam, have ever demanded, either in the UK or anywhere else where they find themselves in a minority, that not only their clergy, but here is the rub, their *laity*, should be subject only to their religion's laws, and not those of the host nation, and moreover, have as their ultimate objective the replacement of the existing legal system by their own. Only Islam makes such an outrageous demand and, what is more, one that is treated sympathetically in ways that would never be entertained if made by any other faith, the most notorious instance being that of the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams. He argued that by incorporating parts of Sharia law into the UK's legal system, a development which he anyway regarded as 'inevitable', it would avoid having to confront Muslims with the 'stark alternatives of cultural loyalty or state loyalty.' (The former secularists of the SWP agreed with Williams in respect of one law, the one outlawing FGM.) The question naturally arises – which Islamic laws did the archbishop have in mind? Those that permit wife beating and marital rape? The killing of apostates? Bigamy? Child marriage? Slavery? The rape of infidel concubines? Female genital mutilation? Would these laws, if introduced, be only applicable to Muslims, thereby creating two parallel legal systems, each with their own courts, judges, police, prisons etc, or would they, as his seemed to be suggesting, apply to the entire UK population, thereby rendering null and void a battery of laws that over centuries, have created a legal system that treats men and women as equals, and protects children from sexual abuse? And surely, in the interests of 'diversity' and 'inclusiveness', if the UK should incorporate into its legal system the laws of Islam, why not also those of every other religion on our planet?

Insulating itself from what it sees as a hostile infidel world, Islam in the UK, as elsewhere in Europe, has done what Islamic states do on a global scale, erecting barriers to ward off the corrosive and seductive evils of modernity and secularisation. In areas where its numbers have achieved a social 'critical mass', as in East London and cities and towns in the Midlands and the north, its policy of self-isolation, described and decried as we have seen by Muslim commentators in terms as strong, if not stronger, than any of mine, is directed chiefly against those most susceptible to the temptations of western ways, the young. Self-appointed or corruptly elected leaders of these 'Muslim communities', though constantly

complaining of Muslim 'marginalisation', do everything within their considerable powers to create as far as possible self-contained Islamic enclaves, with their parallel and rival networks of private and publicly-funded institutions. These include not only an ever growing number of Mosques, many lavishly funded by Saudi Arabia and other oil-rich Islamic states, but Islamic 'community centres', Islamised 'free' and state schools and government approved private Islamic schools, 'academies', *madrassahs* and 'Arabic Centres', where children from mainly Urdu or Bengali speaking families, instead of improving their mastery of the English language better to equip them for life in the UK, chant and try to memorise the *Koran* in an otherwise socially useless tongue, and can be beaten if they fail. From time to time, staff at these institutions are convicted of physically abusing pupils in their charge, but the actual level of such abuse is far higher than the number of such prosecutions would suggest. In March 2006, Ghayasuddin Siddiqui, leader of the Muslim Parliament of Great Britain, admitted *madrassahs* were operating 'outside the law', with the result that with 40% of staff beating their pupils, as many as 100,000 children were at risk of physical abuse. The same situation obtains with Sharia courts. Again, though many are publicly funded, they impose (mainly on women) Sharia laws that conflict with UK law, while vigilantes enforce it by threats and actual violence in areas where mosques proliferate, creating Islamic 'no go' territories where in an increasing number of major European cities, not only public employees but armed police fear to tread. Another victory for multiculturalism and diversity.

In the Islamic diaspora, contact with the infidel is thus reduced to the bare minimum necessary for the internal functioning of the 'tight knit' - a euphemism if ever there was one - Muslim 'community', a strategy greatly and gratuitously facilitated by state-fostered and imposed multi, though in its impact on Muslims, mono-culturalism. This contact, such as it is, is very much a one-way street, with official statistics in a number of European countries, including the UK, revealing a massive and growing draining of resources from the infidel society in the form of crime, welfare services, state benefits, housing, education and the like, while the diaspora contributes as little as possible in the form of tax-paying gainful employment.

This parasitism should surprise no one familiar with the early history of Islam. As we have already seen, it was a creed founded by marauding desert bandits, slavers, rapists and plunderers, origins that are faithfully reflected in the detailed provisions for the distribution of what is called 'booty', human and otherwise, in the *Koran* and numerous *Hadith*. Trade and taxing also loomed large in the early Islamic economy, which is what would one expect from armed bands astride the crossroads between three continents. Fighting, killing, raiding, conquering, enslaving, raping, looting, taxing, buying, selling...anything in fact except actually making something...these were the occupations pursued by the founders of Islam, and they are described and regulated in its founding texts. Productive physical labour and concubinage were reserved for *dhimmis* and slaves, domestic chores and child-bearing for (usually multiple) Muslim wives and concubines.

These features are still to be found, albeit in an attenuated form, in all Islamic states and diaspora enclaves, and go a long way to explaining their chronic backwardness and, in the latter, criminality. Historically, the focus of Islamic economic life in its homelands has not been the farm, mine or factory of capitalism, but the bazaar, the slave market (as in Libya today), plunder and tax.,

just as its political centre has been and remains the Mosque, the harem, the barracks and the palace, not the elected assemblies of the west. Since the Islamic world lacks any tradition or the equivalent of a Jewish or Protestant 'work ethic', with its free and not bonded labour force, and a productive, innovative entrepreneurial class akin to a Brunel, Stephenson or Wedgwood, as distinct from the merchant who merely buys (or as in Mohammed's case, the caravan raider who steals) and sells what others have made, should we be surprised then that even today, the diaspora parallel economy still retains some of these essentially unproductive or parasitic features? Unlike the 'host' economy, it is overwhelmingly male, located chiefly in what is defined technically as the non-productive tertiary or service sector; at the bottom end, corner shops, restaurants, minicab hire and the like, in the middle, the lucrative *halal* trade and at the top end, property dealing and the elite professions. Much of its revenue-generating activities are illegal, reflected, as we have seen both in the UK and Europe, in the vast over-representation of Muslims in the prison population. Prominent among these illegal activities are bogus charities, drug dealing, the embezzlement and misuse of public funds, nepotism and large-scale trafficking, grooming and sexual exploitation of under-age non-Muslim girls. In the last, the 'Muslim community', more precisely its male half, exercises a near total monopoly.

Just how politically sensitive the issue of UK paedophile Muslim rape was became clear when, in July 2007, five years before the issue finally burst into the public domain, a planned televised appeal to the public by the police to help apprehend a Muslim suspected of rape was cancelled to avoid what was called a 'racist backlash', precisely the fear that enabled Muslim men to continue raping non-Muslim girls by the thousands for three decades and more until the scale of the scandal could be contained no longer. Before exploring this sordid subject in detail, let us dispose of the Sharia left red herring that it is racist and 'Islamophobic' (whatever that might mean) to associate Muslim men with organised pimping, trafficking and gang-raping of non-Muslim school girls, because the majority of Muslims are innocent of all three, just as they are of acts of terrorism. True...but also irrelevant. What is relevant is that statistical evidence incontestably proves that both sets of crimes are carried out by Muslims to an extent vastly in excess of their proportion of the total UK population, and it is that immense disproportion which requires to be acknowledged, analysed and explained. As to the first, based on the known religious identity of those convicted of the trafficking, grooming, pimping and rape of mainly underage girls, as we shall see below, of those convicted of these crimes, more than 90% have been Muslim males, while Muslim males comprise less than 5% of the UK population. So whatever the Islamophiles might say to the contrary, as both Corbyn and the SWP have done, the one factor common to nearly all, if not all, organised gang rape in the UK is...the religion of peace.

One of the first Muslim rape gang operations to be brought to trial plied its trade in Rochdale. In May 2012, at Liverpool Crown Court, nine Muslim men were convicted of a string of sexual offences committed against under-age non-Muslim girls. Sentenced to 19 years in prison, the 59-year-old ringleader of the gang called the presiding judge a 'racist bastard' and claimed, through his defence council, that all the accused had been convicted on account of their 'faith and race'. What had happened to the girls was the fault of 'society', and 'now that failure is being blamed on a weak [sic] minority group.' Poor Muslim rapists.

Nevertheless, this 'weak minority group', represented by nine male adults, had for years still managed to groom and then hire out for rape children young enough to be their rapists' daughters and even granddaughters. A middle-aged family man was caught gang raping and pimping children, but, so it was said in his defence, it was society's fault...a 42-year-old Muslim family man, sentenced to nine years for trafficking, made a girl of thirteen pregnant, his defence being that he thought she loved him. None of those sentenced showed the least remorse. And why should they have done? Sharia law permits married men to take concubines, and permits sexual intercourse with girls who have reached puberty. They had simply enjoyed 'what their right hands possessed'. (*Koran*, Chapter 4, Verse 24) Some of the more recent cases were in Rotherham, more of which anon, Oxford, Aylesbury, Keighley and Halifax. In Oxford, a rape and pimping gang of seven Muslim men was convicted in March 2015 of sexually abusing at least 370 girls, some as young as eleven, over a period of 16 years, again with the knowledge and even connivance of the very public officials whose responsibility it was to investigate, report and prevent such crimes.

In July 2015, six members of a largely Muslim Aylesbury rape gang were convicted at the Old Bailey of sexually abusing and pimping two vulnerable young girls over a period of seven years, hiring them out at £25 a time as often as six times day from the age of twelve, to scores of mainly Muslim men. The 'spoils of war' can be good business. It was the usual story of at best indifference to the plight of the victims. The children's charity Bernardos became aware of the abuse as far back as 2008, and 'made a referral to the local authority and the relevant agencies'. As in all the other cases of Muslim rape gangs, nothing was done, or, as Michelle Lee-Izu for Bernardos put it rather tactfully, there was 'insufficient action'. Evidently, Bernardos, like the other 'relevant authorities', let the matter rest, because the raping and pimping continued unchecked for another five years. Unusually, David Johnstone, Director of Buckingham's Children's Services (sic) did not plead fear of accusations of racism but ignorance as the cause of his department's complicity in the crimes being committed under its very nose: 'We know a great deal more [now] about children's sexual exploitation than we did back then'.

The reader will in all probability immediately recognise this as the identical explanation proffered by the Roman Catholic Church for its complicity in the systematic abuse by its clergy of children in its care, not just over decades, but centuries. Did David Johnstone really expect anyone to believe that after years of training for and service in an agency whose sole responsibility was to protect the welfare of children, none of its staff saw anything wrong 'back then' as he puts it, or illegal, in the systematic rape of girls as young as twelve, or if they did, none had the duty and authority to prevent it? I do not believe Johnstone's explanation is the correct one. I suspect he didn't expect anyone would either. One can hardly imagine such a relaxed attitude being adopted had their victims been the children of the social workers in question. (One of the two victims had been on their so-called 'at risk' register from the age of seven.) Whatever the cultural and moral relativists might say to the contrary, since time immemorial, any half-decent person has known that the rape of children is wrong, and the laws that say so, at least in non-Islamic countries, are just as old.

Those who chose to ignore the plight of the rape gang's victims were not in other respects morally deficient, or ignorant of the laws on rape and under-age

sex. Indeed, one of their tasks was to see that they were enforced. The real cause, one that until other similar scandals were uncovered, dared not speak its name, was fear...fear of being branded a racist and an 'Islamophobe' by their friends, work colleagues and superiors, and criminalised by a battery of so-called 'hate speech' laws, especially those of 2005, which were specifically designed to prevent any serious criticism of Islam; and again, fear, especially in difficult economic times, of losing one's job as a result of such branding. This very same fear inhibited a steward from apprehending the Muslim responsible for the suicide bomb attack at the Manchester Arena in 2017. (See Preface) How else explain that over a period of more than three decades, of the UK's 1.3 million school teachers and support staff, 100,000 police and as many social workers, scarcely one was prepared to blow the whistle on the gang rapists whose victims, in their tens of thousands, were entitled to their protection from their abusers? Avoiding accusations of racism and preserving 'social cohesion' came top of their list of priorities, and the child victims of gang rape, firmly at the bottom. And this was the UK in the twenty-first century, not the Arabian peninsula in the seventh. Had the roles been reversed, with twelve-year-old Muslim girls being groomed and hired out to be raped by non-Muslim men, then back in 2006, Buckinghamshire Children's Services, just like their counterparts in Rochdale, Rotherham, Oxford, Keighley and Sheffield and a score or more other locations, would have experienced no difficulty in recognising child rape for what it was then, is now, always has been and always will be; an abominable crime. We can be reasonably sure that more trials of Muslim rape and pimping gangs are in the pipe line, and now that the game is up for those who have been protecting them, that more will be apprehended and convicted. (I wrote this in 2019. ,This prediction has proved to be correct. As of 2023, the backlog of those so accused ran into the hundreds.) The final official report on the all-Muslim Oxford rape gang described in some detail the humiliations and sexual tortures inflicted on young girls by men reared from the cradle on the religion of peace and compassion:

The sexual abuse included vaginal, anal and oral rape, and also involved the use of a variety of objects such as *knives, meat cleavers and baseball bats*. It was accompanied by humiliating and degrading conduct such as biting, scratching, and acts of urinating, being suffocated, and tied up. (Emphasis added)

Of the hundreds of girls abused, six were reported missing 500 times from either family or care homes. As in all the other cases, no investigation as to their whereabouts was conducted, though the reason why they were missing was common knowledge amongst those whose job it was to find and protect them. This included the police. A father who tracked down the whereabouts of his daughter, and found her being sexually abused by Muslim man, after calling the police, was himself arrested. A victim of Muslim child rape described an identical police practice in Rotherham, in her memoir, titled *Snatched*:

'Dad explained that he'd been threatened with arrest by the police if he attempted to rescue me from the flat [where she was being gang raped]: "I tried El, I tried...but the police dragged me away in handcuffs [sic]. I was even told they might end up bringing you out in a body bag if I went back there again." ...He'd then returned to the flat to try and get me out and was handcuffed a second time.

[sic] “They took me to the station, threatened me with arrest. I was told that if I went back a third time, they’d put me in prison for stalking.””

Not just local Muslims, but those from far and wide came to rape the girls, while local girls were ferried in min-cabs around England for the same purposes, and with total impunity, under the noses of P.C. police, brain-dead or brain-washed social workers, corrupt local politicians, un-elected Muslim ‘community leaders’ and misogynist imams. This highly organised and for its pimps, highly lucrative Muslim rape industry, with its transport network and safe rape houses, operated for at least 16 years in Oxford, unapprehended by imams, police and various other authorities whose responsibility it was to prevent it. The Keighley rape gang consisted of 12 Muslim men, who in February 2016 were together sentenced to a total of 143 years in prison. One 13-year-old girl, put to work serving the sexual needs of scores of Muslim men, was reported missing by her mother 71 times. The police response was to tell her to keep a diary of her daughter’s movements. The girl in question, whose testimony in court helped to convict the rapists, was known by social services to be subject to sexual abuse, but instead of reporting this to the police, they suggested she use a coil to avoid becoming pregnant. On one occasion, she was raped by five savages in succession in a back alley. Sentencing the convicted paedophiles, Judge Roger Thomas said they had taken ‘terrible and heartless sexual advantage’ of the girl. Zafar Ali, a Muslim local Councillor, however begged to differ. He claimed that ‘it takes two to tango’, implying that this was not a case of gang rape, but teenage promiscuity. There was ‘some feeling that the girl had her part to play’. (This was a judgement shared by the Home Office during the tenure of Labour’s Jacqui Smith, which in a circular to all police authorities in England and Wales, described Muslim gang rape as an ‘informed choice’ on the part of its victims.) This ‘feeling’ is of course the deeply entrenched Muslim conviction that rape is as much, if not, more, the fault of the victim than the rapist, and when the victim is not a Muslim, that it is not even to be considered rape at all, but simply ‘the spoils of war’. Another case resulted in June 2016 in the conviction of no fewer than fifteen Halifax Muslims, who between them received jails terms totalling 168 years for raping, grooming and trafficking, in plain English, pimping, under-age girls, in one case, one of thirteen years.

The focus in the wake of these trials was the political correctness which led to the abysmal failure of public agencies to protect vulnerable girls from being reduced to sexual slavery. However late in the day, too late in fact, this was of course true. But political correctness had not been totally dispelled, for why else was there no criticism of those who, by virtue of their position and role in the ‘Islamic community’, must have known, from its very beginning, not only the purpose and scale of these operations, but the identity of their perpetrators and even of many of their customers? How could such an activity, conducted quite openly on such a scale, over so many years, on a daily basis, by hundreds, probably thousands of Muslim male adults, many of them family men, living in a closed in, almost hermetically sealed ‘community’, remain unknown to the one individual who more than any other, was responsible for his community’s ‘spiritual’ and moral welfare? We speak of course of the eyes, the ears, and in theory at least, conscience, for what it is worth, of this ‘community’...the imam, always ready to take offence at often imagined slights to his own faith, but

wilfully blind to crimes committed by those who profess it. This accusation is not made lightly. For all the assurances that these so-called 'Muslim communities' are, like some quaint old English village, 'warm', 'vibrant' and 'close' or 'tightly knit', these and other trials revealed them as ugly, oppressive misogynistic self-generated, segregationist quasi-parasitic ghettos in which all manner of primitive, savage, vile and frequently illegal customs and activities flourish, unchecked and even condoned not only, as we now know, by public agencies, but without doubt by those with authority within the 'community' itself.

In the 39...yes, *thirty-nine* locations where they have been trials and convictions of Muslim gang rapists, traffickers and pimps, there are all told 747 mosques; 4 in Liverpool, Colchester 2, Coventry 24, Yeovil 1, Dewsbury 31, Manchester 66, Peterborough 8, Barking 1, Ipswich 2, Accrington 3, Preston 17, Huddersfield 15, Sheffield 7, Luton 25, Oldham 30, Blackburn 45, Leeds 26, Skipton 1, Nelson 19, Derby 14, Leicester 73, Accrington 7, Chesham 2, Barking 8, Middlesbrough 7, Bristol 19, Slough 15, Banbury 3, Newcastle 16, Oxford 7, Blackpool 2, Rotherham 7, Birmingham 164, Cardiff 19, Telford 4, Keighley 7, Halifax 10, Rochdale 18 and Buckinghamshire 17. So, we had 744 mosques servicing areas where Muslim rape and pimping gangs had been operating quite openly and with impunity, and on what the Jay report on Rotherham calls an '*industrial scale*', in some cases, for periods of *thirty years and more*. Assuming that each of these mosques was staffed by its resident clergy, it is surely reasonable to ask, how come that with hundreds of pimps and tens, possibly hundreds of thousands of their rapist customers in their congregations, not one imam out of a potential 744 had an inkling of what was going on? And if, as seems more likely, they did, why did they not report it to the police?

Beginning no later than the early 1980s, year after year, tens of thousands of non-Muslim school girls were being groomed, trafficked and then gang-raped on a Sharia assembly line by what must have been hundreds of thousands of utterly depraved Muslim males, the majority of them family men... *and yet not one clerical whistle-blower*, even though they were safe in the knowledge that they could not be accused of Islamophobia or racism. We now, belatedly, demand that Catholic clergy be held to account for their acquiescence in similar crimes ...why not imams? And where were the feminists? The metooers? Obsessing about the 'white patriarchy' in the columns of the *Guardian*. Why had no mainstream politician asked these so obvious questions?

Yet the already quoted outspoken Dr. Taj Hargey, Imam of the Oxford Islamic Congregation, certainly had, and he provided the answer that that infidels feared to give. In mosques across the country, he said that imams preached a doctrine that 'denigrates all women, but treats whites with particular contempt'. Muslim men are taught that women are

second-class citizens, little more than chattels or possessions over whom they have absolute authority...The view of some Islamic preachers towards white women can be appalling They encourage their followers to believe that these women are habitually promiscuous, decadent and sleazy - sins which are made all the worse by the fact that. they are kafirs or non-believers...According to this mentality, these women deserve to be punished for their behaviour by being exploited and degraded.

Should we be surprised then that when asked in 2013 to read out to their congregations a condemnation of gang rape, less than a third of the UK's Mosques did so, with one dismissing the request as 'a stunt'? By their silence, those imams that refused stand condemned, morally if not legally, of condoning Islamic gang rape, according to the principle, *qui tacit, consentire videtur*. No less guilty were Corbyn and the Sharia left who, by denying the very existence of organised Muslim paedophiliac gang rape, also helped to protect and perpetuate it. For the Labour Leader, despite the mounting statistical evidence that proved the contrary, gang rape was a general problem, not a Muslim one. 'The problem is the crime that is committed against women in any community. Much crime is committed by white people.' (yes...hardly a surprise, since they make about 85% of the UK's population.) 'Crime is committed by people of other communities as well'. Again, true, but totally irrelevant, as Corbyn must surely have known, because the issue was not crime in general, such as speeding, drink driving, murder, drug-dealing, shop-lifting, burglary, dropping litter etc etc or even all those of a sexual nature, but specifically, *organised, 'industrial scale' grooming and gang rape*, in which Muslim men, as had been proved beyond doubt by a series of trials, exercised an almost total monopoly, being statistically at least 700 times more likely to commit this particular crime than non-Muslims. (See below for the proof.) If, as Corbyn seemed to be saying, 'industrial-scale' grooming, trafficking, pimping and gang rape of children are to be found in equal measure across all 'communities' (again, presumably, as defined by religion) then, according to the 2011 Census, Muslims should account for 4.4% of perpetrators, equal to their 'community's' share of the total UK male population, and likewise Hindus 1.3%, Sikhs 0.7%, Jews 0.4%, Buddhists 0.4%, Christians (and *pro rata* with their various subdivisions, such as Quakers, Methodists etc) 59.5%, those of no religion 27.5% and unstated, 7.2%. Peter McLoughlin, the author of *Easy Meat*, posted on line a running total of gang rape convictions. Updated as of February 28, 2019, of 360 convicted of child gang rape, assuming, almost certainly wrongly, that all those with non-Muslim names were not converts to the religion of peace, at least 307 were Muslims, just under 90% and not, as Corbyn would seem to be implying, 4.4%.

White girls were not the only victims of Muslim child rape. Initially, until their menfolk fought back, *and were arrested for doing so*, Sikh girls were the prime target. Under the nose of Corbyn, in his own Islington North Parliamentary constituency, imams he surely knew personally had officiated at illegal Sharia marriages between children as young as nine and much older (probably closely related) Muslim men, just as they do in Yemen and other Islamic latrines where the law and example of the paedophile prophet holds its misogynistic sway. In the words of the British imam, Bilal Philips (sic), 'the prophet Mohammed practiced it, it wasn't abuse or exploitation, it was marriage'. Yes indeed, between a man of more than fifty years and a child of nine. And as the prophet did, so can every Muslim male: 'Verily you have in the prophet an excellent model.' (*Koran*, 33:27) By denying what the criminal justice system had proved beyond all doubt, Corbyn was in fact perpetuating the very political correctness that had made Rotherham and a score or more similar tragedies across the UK possible.

Bearing in mind that Corbyn had hoped one day to be Prime Minister, and that nearly all these cases occurred in towns and cities with large and growing Muslim electorates, one has to ask, were there no depths of dishonesty, political irresponsibility and sheer depravity he would not sink to in order to remain in

good standing with Labour's Muslim constituency? As the Jay report says, 'in their desire to accommodate a [Muslim] community that would be expected to vote Labour', Labour politicians preferred 'not to rock the boat, to keep a lid on it' hoping 'it would go away'. Exactly. According to a study by the British Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences, in the General Election of December 12, 2019, compared to Labour's overall share of the total votes cast of 32.2%, the Muslim vote was 85% Labour, 10% Tory, and 5% for other parties. In the General Election of 2015, with the Jewish Ed Miliband as party leader, compared to Labour's share of the total vote of 30.4%, only 64% of Muslims voted Labour, 25% Tory and 11% for other parties. Corbyn's denial of the proven vastly disproportionate Muslim involvement in gang rape was, ironically, in its turn, refuted in the findings of the reform Islam Quilliam Foundation, published in December 20017, which showed that since 2005, 84% of gang grooming rape crimes have been committed by Pakistanis, in other words, by Muslims, who regarded white girls as 'worthless'.

Chief Crown Prosecutor Nazir Afzal did not try to deny the truth of this statistic - how could he when he had personally brought many of these perpetrators to trial while serving in the North West - but he feared that public awareness of the predominance of Muslims in grooming and raping would facilitate the growth of the far right. If it had done (and there is no evidence that it did), that would surely be the responsibility of politicians on the rest of the political spectrum, all of whom lacked the courage to place the blame for a crime, one that before the emergence of the 'Muslim community' was unknown, where it belonged, with the mysongistic attitude of many Muslim men towards women in general, and *kuffar* women in particular. And had it not occurred to him that attempting to conceal a truth that the public was already well aware of would have had exactly the effect he feared? If he wanted, like Corbynista Labour, to 'keep the lid' on such publicity in future, the only answer would have been for such trials to held *in camera*.

At least Afzal was honest in acknowledging the religious identity of the preparators. He could hardly not, since had been prosecuting them. The same cannot be said of the Socialist Workers Party, committed as it was to its strategy of Sharia-friendly shibboleth-dumping, in this case, the right of under-age infidel girls not to be groomed, trafficked and gang-raped by Muslim men. The SWP agreed there had indeed been a rape issue in Rotherham, but it was a white one, covered up by white police. The *Socialist Worker*'s non-reporting of the Rotherham and other similar rape scandals faithfully applied the axiom enunciated by the Sharia feminists Lindsey German and Laurie Penny, namely that white males (unless of course they are converts to Islam) were the worst of all offenders when it came to the abuse of women. Muslim rape and pimping gangs did not exist. It was white men who were doing the raping and getting away with it, because the (white) police were letting them. It was a case of a race closing ranks, and then putting the blame on Muslims. As proof to support this claim, the SWP's *Socialist Worker* of September 2, 2014, quoted what purported to be an unbiased authority, Shaista Gohir of the Muslim Women's Network UK. She claimed that the problem is not the rape of white girls by Muslim men, but the toleration by the police of the rape of Muslim girls by white men: 'The danger is that when a youngster says they have been exploited by a white man, they won't be a priority.' Gohir was in the same state of denial as the authors of a leaflet published in 2010

jointly by Unite Against Fascism [sic] and the Muslim Council of Britain, which dismissed as ‘racist myths’ reports of ‘Asian men “grooming” white girls.’ (Once again, Islam becomes a race)

No-one dependent solely on the SWP, Corbyn the Muslim Council of Britain or the Muslim Women’s Network for information on this subject would have had the least inkling that as reported by the official Alexis Jay report, in Rotherham alone, with a population of 109,000, ‘at least 1,400’ young, mainly working class white girls had been subjected to decades of sexual abuse by organised Muslim grooming and pimping gangs, or that in one of many cases of police collusion with the rapists, when officers came across an eleven-year-old girl being gang raped in a derelict house by five Muslim men, in an English version of Sharia law, they promptly arrested the girl, not for adultery, but for being drunk and disorderly. Instead, the above cited leaflet purveyed a fable of public authorities in Rotherham and elsewhere who, instead of hunting down white rapists, had preferred to focus on mythical Muslim sex offenders. Everyone now knows that the exact opposite was the case. No white men in Rotherham had been charged with, let alone convicted of these crimes, not because of a police-cover-up, but because none was guilty. As was subsequently established beyond any doubt, the only police cover-up was one that allowed Muslim men to rape as many as 1,400 white girls with impunity.

Consider this. Muslim males comprised 1.5 % of Rotherham’s population, a little over 1,500. Of these, roughly half fell into the age group convicted of gang-rape, between the late teens and middle fifties. As of 2018, *over half* of this group had either been convicted of gang rape, or were being investigated by the police as suspects for the same crime. Yet Corbyn insisted that Muslims were no more likely to commit child gang-rape than members of any other ‘community’. Just how toxic the Muslim gang rape sandal had become for the Corbynistas was demonstrated when Bradford West Labour MP Naz Shah, after denouncing as a Nazi the *Sun’s* Editor Kevin Mackenzie for running a story by Rotherham Labour MP Sarah Champion focusing on the identity of the gang rapists, days later approvingly retweeted in good faith a spoof tweet which read: ‘Those abused girls in Rotherham and elsewhere just need to shut their mouths. For the good of diversity.’ (Shah had previously had the whip withdrawn when she approved an online tweet proposing a Nazi-style deportation of all Israel’s Jews to the USA.) When in July 2018, a petition was circulated among MP’s demanding tougher sentences for gang groomers and rapists, it was signed by only 20 MPs. Shah’s petition against the *Sun* was signed by over a hundred. Please read this sentence again, and then consider its implications.

Thorough as it was, the salient weakness of the Jay report was that in one crucial respect, it too suffered from the same wilful myopia that it rightly saw as an integral cause of the rape gang scandal...political correctness. Throughout her report she refers to the perpetrators as being of ‘Pakistani heritage’, never as Muslims, which in nearly every case across the UK, they were. Consequently, when she took to task public officials and institutions who failed to report or even colluded with their crimes, she invariably attributed this to a fear of being accused of racism and not ‘Islamophobia’, a term that for all its frequent (and spurious) invocations in other contexts, never appeared in her entire report, because if it had, it would have identified the rapists as Muslims and not just Pakistanis. In depicting the rape gangs as exclusively a product of Pakistani culture, she

therefore necessarily excluded their religious dimension. But the Cologne sex assaults of New Year's Eve, 2015, were not perpetrated in the main by men of 'Pakistani heritage' but by Muslims from a wide variety of Islamic countries. French rape gangs are mainly of Algerian origin, in Holland, Moroccan, in Sweden, many are Afghans, in Germany, Middle Eastern. The common denominator therefore is not that they all share the same ethnicity, but the same *religion*, Islam. For the same reason, Jay also never asked the highly pertinent question; why are these rape gangs composed mainly of men of 'Pakistani heritage' and not also of men from an identical or very similar ethnic background, namely Indian Sikhs, Buddhists and Hindus? However, while steering well clear of the teachings of Islam on the treatment of women, the Jay report did reveal that Muslims girls had indeed also been horrifically sexually abused, but not by white men, as the *Socialist Worker* implies. Citing the UK Muslim Women's Network study of the sexual abuse of Muslim girls, the Jay report says that contrary to the allegation made by the Network's Shaista Gohir,

they were most vulnerable to men from their own communities who manipulated cultural norms [sic] to prevent them from reporting their abuse [The 'tightly-knit, warm, vibrant Muslim community']. The Network's own report found that 'offending behaviour mostly involved men operating in groups...The victim was being passed around and prostituted amongst many other men...The physical abuse included oral, anal and vaginal rape; role play, insertion of objects into the vagina, severe beatings, burnings with cigarettes, lying down, enacting rape that included ripping clothes off and sexual activity over the webcam.'

And Muslim clerics would lecture the infidel west on its low morals, and the lack of respect shown by its men towards 'their' women? Anyone who doubts the scale of the Muslim rape industry and the degree of complicity of those whose job it was to protect its victims and prosecute the perpetrators, should read the Jay and Casey reports, which are readily available online, as an antidote to the lies of Corbyn and the *Socialist Worker*. Here are just a few samples from the Jay report, which for the first time, lifted the lid on the sexual code of countless male Muslim savages in the UK. We learn that the rape industry in Rotherham, as elsewhere, was closely linked to the mini-cab trade. With a population of 109,000, Rotherham, was serviced by well over a hundred cab firms, and no fewer than 1,300 drivers:

One of the common threads running through child sexual exploitation across England has been the prominent role of taxi drivers in being directly linked to children who were being abused. This was the case in Rotherham from a very early stage... In the early 2000s, some secondary school heads were reporting that girls were being picked up at lunchtime and being taken away to provide oral sex to men in the lunch break.

Despite repeated requests by various agencies made to the police to take legal action against the companies and drivers involved in drug dealing and various kinds of sex trafficking and abuse, they declined to do so. Need one wonder why? These are just three case reports:

We read cases where a child was doused in petrol and threatened with being set alight, children who were threatened with guns, children who witnessed brutally violent rapes and were threatened they would be the next victim if they told anyone. Girls as young as eleven [one was only nine] were raped by large numbers of male perpetrators, one after another...In two of the cases we read, fathers tracked down their daughters and tried to remove them from houses where they were being abused, *only to be arrested themselves* when police were called to the scene. In a small number of cases...the victims [sic] were arrested for offences such as breach of the peace or being drunk and disorderly, with no action taken against the perpetrators of rape and sexual assault against children...One child who was prepared to give evidence received a text saying the perpetrator had her younger sister and the choice of what happened next was up to her. She withdrew her statements. At least two other families were terrorised by groups of perpetrators, sitting in cars outside the family home, smashing windows, making abusive and threatening phone calls. On some occasions child victims went back to perpetrators in the belief that this was the only way their parents and other children in the family would be safe. In the most extreme cases, no one in the family believed the authorities could protect them. (Emphasis added)

To which can be added that beginning at the age of thirteen, between 1998 and 2001, just one Rotherham girl was subjected to illegal sexual intercourse by at least a hundred Muslim men, being made pregnant when aged fourteen. Bearing in mind that at least 1,400 girls in the town had been subjected to illegal sexual exploitation, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that most of Rotherham's adult male Muslims had availed themselves of the services provided by its rape 'industry'. Cases such as these proved that for years, in fact, the best part of three decades, Muslim men were free to rape whom they wished, not just under the noses of but protected by the police and social workers, and that everyone in Rotherham knew it, just as they did in other towns and cities where pimping devotees of the religion of compassion plied their obscene trade. And what was the response of the normally anti-police Sharia left to the exposure of the Rotherham scandal? It was to stage a demonstration in Rotherham, not in defence of working-class girls abused by Muslim rapists, not against police complicity and corruption, but...yes... against 'Islamophobia', just as their German counterparts demonstrated against 'racism' after the night of the Muslim sexual assaults in Cologne on New Year's Eve, 2015.

No evidence had come to light in any of the places where Muslim rape gangs have been brought to trial and convicted that similar crimes had been committed by non-Muslims, 'white' or otherwise. So how did this fairy tale come to be taken seriously? Surely even Sharia left credulity (or mendacity) has its limits. And yet, apparently not. Concerned as always to preserve its harmonious working relationship with Muslim pressure groups, the SWP offered its own 'leftist' explanation for what took place in Rotherham: 'Blame cops and the cuts, not "political correctness"' (i.e., ignoring Muslim sex crimes). One is left puzzling: exactly how do cuts in public expenditure turn Muslim men into gang rapists? Maybe it is the same alchemy that we are told transforms them into Islamic State Jihadis.

Much was said, *post facto*, both in official reports, and in the media and by politicians, about the 'failings' of the police and care agencies. Such an explanation would be plausible if confined to one or a few instances in one

location. But we are dealing here with highly organised, professional gangs that had operated, supposedly undetected but, so we learn now, protected and unhindered, in some cases for more than three decades, in cities and towns all over England. We can be sure that still more await detection and hopefully, prosecution. Official acquiescence in such a multiplicity of identical large-scale operations, spanning such a long period of time, can only be explained by causes that are far deeper seated than the 'failings' of individuals. How come that these 'failings' came to be shared by several generations of tens of thousands of public officials from all over England, ranging from social workers, care home staff, school teachers and council employees responsible for child protection, to elected politicians and high-ranking police officers? No intelligent person, confronted with the facts of the case, will believe that a series of identical responses to a series of identical criminal activities, occurring over a period of up to thirty years, from Rotherham, Keighley, Rochdale and Sheffield in the north, to Oxford and Aylesbury in the south and Bristol and Cardiff in the west, can be explained in each case by local individual professional incompetence or, as the SWP would have one believe, by cuts in public spending that only began at the earliest in 2010? What we have here are not 'failings', an explanation that itself fails to explain anything.

Allowing unhindered the operation of the Muslim rape industry over decades was the fruit of a consistent *policy*, one not generated independently, locally and 'on the hoof' so to speak by those charged with various public duties. Its nationwide uniformity totally excludes such origins. It can only have come from on high, from central government, specifically the Home Office and departments and agencies responsible for the making and implementing of social policy, and at the bottom of the chain of command, from attitudes and practices instilled into staff which resulted in the toleration of bestial crimes that if committed by white men on Muslim girls, would, once detected, have led to immediate prosecutions.

Here we have the most damning evidence, coming from the very top of the criminal justice system, that these 'failings' were in fact deliberate government policy. Crown Prosecutor Nazir Afzal told the BBC that in 2008,

the Home Office sent a circular to all police in the country saying 'as far as these young girls who are being exploited in towns and cities, we believe they have made an *informed choice* about their sexual behaviour and it is therefore not for you police officers to get involved in.' (Emphasis added)

'...being exploited', that is, groomed, trafficked and gang-raped, an '*informed choice*'? 'Informed' by what? And 'informed choice' or not, the girls who were presumed to be making it were nearly all under 16 years of age, some as young as 11. The Home Office was therefore *instructing* the police force to condone one of the most serious crimes on the statute book. And who at the time was Home Secretary? Labour's Jacqui Smith. And yet it was Smith who in the same year, after admitting that she did not feel safe walking the streets of London at night, introduced legislation making it a criminal offence to pay for sex with a prostitute controlled or trafficked by a pimp - unless, so it would seem, the pimp or trafficker was a Muslim. The Home Office instruction to the police ensured that whatever Smith feared might await her on the streets of London, far worse would continue to go unprevented and unpunished in the safe rape houses of Rotherham.

But that is far from the whole story. According to Rotherham's Labour MP Sarah Champion, the refusal by the police and central government to prosecute the rape gangs dated back at least as far as 2002, when 'the Home Office knew all about child exploitation in Rotherham', the records of which subsequently and, some might suspect, conveniently went missing. 'How many lives could have been protected' she asked, if at the time, 'swift action had been taken'. As always, 'community cohesion' dictated otherwise.

This policy continued under the Conservatives, as a series of trials proved beyond any doubt that as previously, police forces across the country had allowed rape gangs to ply their lucrative trade with impunity. Then, in what many took to be departure from this policy, in July 2018, the then Home Secretary, Sajid Javid, announced that the Home Office would be conducting an investigation into the rape industry, followed by the publication of a report on its findings, conclusions and recommendations. It would be an investigation, promised Javid, in which there would be 'no no-go areas', while he personally pledged that he would 'not let cultural or political sensitivities get in the way of understanding the problem and doing something about it.' Brave words, and we can believe that he meant them. But it was not to be. 18 months on, and with no sign of Javid's promised report, in December 2019, the *Independent* inquired when or indeed if the report was to be made available to the public. The reply from the Home Office, now headed by Javid's replacement, Priti Patel, was that it was indeed complete, but its release to the public, countless thousands of whose children had been the victims of the crimes which had been the reason for and subject of the investigation, was 'not in the public interest'. A petition demanding a parliamentary debate on why the report had not been released gathered in a matter of days 22,000 more than the required 100,000 signatures necessary for a government response. The report would not be released, came the reply, for the reasons already stated. What it did say simply echoed what Corbyn had previously said on the same subject, in that firstly, just like Corbyn, it made no mention of trafficking, grooming and gang rape, the original specific terms of reference of the inquiry, speaking only of 'child sexual abuse' in general and, secondly, also just like Corbyn, it ignored the religious identity of the overwhelming majority of the perpetrators, instead claiming that 'child sexual abusers' come from 'many different age groups, ethnicities and faiths'. That may be so. But there are no Christian, Sikh, Hindu, Mormon, Jainist, Zoroastrian, Shinto, Yazidi, Taoist, Jewish or Buddhist rape gangs, only Muslim.

Again just like Corbyn, and one suspects also for the same electoral reasons as his, the Tories were obviously concerned to deny any connection between Islam and gang rape. This might also explain why in April 2021, a Tory councilor was suspended after the BBC unearthed a 2019 tweet that said Tommy Robinson had been talking 'complete and utter sense' about 'Islamic problems.' Defending the suspension, a Tory spokesperson said 'any form of racism will not be tolerated'. Yes...but saying Islam, which is not a race but a religion, has 'problems', is not and cannot be racism, any more than saying the Catholic Church has, or Scientology. There are Muslim scholars and clerics who also happen to agree that Islam has 'problems', some of whom I cite in this book. Are they too racists? And did not Boris Johnson back in 2018 find himself in woke water for saying it was 'ridiculous that people [sic] should choose to go around dressed like letter boxes? It is those infidels, be they Tories, Corbynistas or

whatever, who do not have a ‘problem’ with Islam’s teachings on, for example, homosexuality and the treatment of women, both contrary to UK law, who are perhaps the biggest problem of all. As for the execrable Smith, we have already met her doing her bit for Allah when she denied entry into the UK by the Dutch MP Geert Wilders, who had been invited to Westminster to show his film ‘Fitna’, which with excerpts from the Koran, and sermons by Muslim preachers, demonstrated the link between Islam and terrorism. As the Jay report strongly implies with regard to Muslim rape gangs, here too the decision could have been motivated by the same concern for Labour’s Muslim vote.

There is evidence to suspect that the Home Office instruction to police chiefs to give what amounted to a free pass to Muslim rape gangs was in many cases superfluous, as the Rotherham example, one of many, proves. Here as in other English towns and cities in the Midlands and the north, a (police) ‘hands off’ policy had already been operating for years before it was issued. In an article in *The Times* of January 18, 2020, by Andrew Norfolk, the first mainstream journalist to report on the Muslim gang rape industry, he revealed that ‘a senior police officer admitted that his force ignored the sexual abuse of girls by Pakistani [sic] grooming gangs for *decades*’. (Emphasis added) The reason he gave for not enforcing the laws on trafficking, pimping, rape and under-age sex was that his force was ‘afraid of increasing “racial tensions”.’ Norfolk continues: ‘After a five-year [sic] investigation, the Independent Office for Police Conduct upheld a complaint that the Rotherham officer told a missing child’s distraught father that the town “would erupt” if it was known that Asian men were routinely having sex with [no, raping] under-age white girls. The Chief Inspector is said to have described the abuse as “Paki-shagging” and to have said it had been “going on” for 30 years. “With it being Asians, we can’t afford for this to be coming out.”’ The fact that just one incident took *five years* to resolve is surely proof of the complicity of high-ranking police officers, not just in Rotherham we can be sure, in the Muslim rape industry. So much then for the much-vaunted ‘community cohesion’, which in this case as in many others, came at the price of the gang-raping and brutalisation of well over a thousand under-age white girls in just one town by in many cases, middle-aged married Muslim men. An investigation by the South Yorkshire Police Authority into the conduct of 47 Rotherham police officers in relation to the town’s rape industry found no grounds for disciplinary action against any of them.

Across the Pennines, it was the same sordid story. The *Manchester Evening News* of January 14, 2020 featured a report on the findings of what it described as ‘a blistering inquiry’ into a ‘vast south Manchester grooming gang [that] targeted vulnerable children “in plain sight” of police and social workers, who then failed to protect kids from abuse and even death.’ Yes, even death. And, as in Rotherham and a score or more other locations, ‘in plain sight’ of the police. The report continues: ‘Children were raped and abused by up to 100 members of a grooming gang sixteen years ago, but despite police and social workers knowing what was happening they weren’t stopped.’ Even after a series of high-profile trials in other cities, it was business as usual in Manchester. ‘Greater Manchester Police dropped an operation that identified up to 97 [sic] potential suspects and at least 57 potential victims. Eight of the men went on to later assault or rape girls.’ Yet, ‘as late as August 2018, the Chief Constable’, one must presume still dutifully following Home Office instructions, ‘refused [sic] to reopen the dropped

operation.' It strains all but the crassest credulity beyond breaking point that for decades, this and other identical scandals across England went unnoticed by the Home Office, the criminal justice system, the College of Police and the National Police Chiefs Council...and, until the *Times* broke ranks, the mainstream media.

The degree of Manchester police complicity in the city's rape industry initially came to light in 2012, as a result of the trial and conviction of nine Muslim men, aged between 24 and 59, on charges of rape, sex trafficking and conspiracy to engage in sexual activity with a child. The charges related to the sexual abuse of underage girls that took place in Rochdale in 2008 and 2009. A number of media investigations revealed that beginning as far back as 2003, Sara Rowbotham, Team Co-ordinator of the Rochdale Crisis Intervention Team, made more than 180 (repeat, 180) attempts to alert the police and other public authorities to the activities of rape gangs, but to no effect, the excuse of the Crown Prosecution Service being that the witnesses (the girls who had been raped) were not reliable. This is not the procedure followed in 'normal' rape cases, where all such allegations are taken seriously and acted upon. Maybe in deference to the religious identity of the accused, in conformity with Sharia law, the CPS was waiting for four adult Muslim male witnesses to come forward.

In a TV documentary on the Rochdale scandal, Ann Cryer, the local (Labour) MP, said she tried to persuade local Muslim leaders, including a councillor and some Elders, to 'go knocking on doors and say "this behaviour is un-Islamic, and I want it to stop because I'm going to tell the whole [Muslim] community about you and what you're doing if you don't." Now they weren't prepared to do that.' Maybe it was because the 'behaviour' in question was not quite as un-Islamic as she thought. She had also been 'round the police station virtually every week', 'begging' the police to take action against the rape gangs, but 'neither the police nor social services would touch these cases. I think it was because they were afraid of being called racist.' So...yet again. And obviously more so than being accused of facilitating the mass rape of children. And I do mean mass. Largely from dysfunctional backgrounds and many living in care homes, hooked on drugs and often as not drunk when abused, the girls were routinely raped on an assembly line by as many as five men in succession, one girl by 20. One 13-year-old girl had an abortion after being made pregnant by a rapist. One 15-year-old girl was awarded by a trafficker to another gang member as a birthday present, who then raped her.

All this and more took place under the noses of Manchester social services, police and justice (sic) system, just as it did in Rotherham where, as recorded by the Casey report, under-aged girls were being gang-raped, 'on an industrial scale' round the clock, 24-7, in their hundreds. Yet in the 16 years between 1997 and 2013, the town's police managed to secure only five convictions for sexual offences against children...an average of 0.31 per annum. (But perhaps I am being too harsh, because the Rotherham conviction rate was exactly ten times higher than the CPS's for another crime with an Islamic dimension, Female Genital Mutilation. With a jurisdiction not just over a town with a population of 100,000, but over England and Wales, with one of 56 million, in the 35 years since it was outlawed in 1985, the CPS, with a staff of 6,000, had secured one successful prosecution for FGM, a crime no less rife, vile and misogynistic than gang rape. One conviction in 35 years works out at 0.029 per annum.) As the Jay report tells it, two opportunities to effect an arrest and conviction for gang rape in Rotherham

occurred when ‘fathers tracked down their daughters and tried to remove them from houses where they were being abused’. Arrests did indeed take place when the police were called to the scene... but of the fathers, not the rapists.

In both Rotherham and Manchester, collusion was not confined to the police and the justice system and, until the *Times* broke ranks, the silent media. There was also the part played by elected politicians and departments of local authorities for which they were responsible in erecting a protective wall around the city’s thriving child rape industry. In Rotherham, such was the extent of collusion by the town’s Labour council and officials in the sexual abuse of young girls revealed by the Casey and Jay reports that in August 2015, the government issued a statement headed ‘Rotherham’s State of Denial’. It declared that as there was no ‘reasonable prospect of Rotherham putting its own house in order’, ‘the Secretary of State [for Communities and Local Government] was justified in appointing commissioners to take over the executive functions of Rotherham Council’...not for any conventional malfeasance or misconduct, such as corruption, but for something unprecedented in the entire history of British local government...for its denial and abetting of child rape. (This ‘first’ for Labour was followed in 2019 by a second no less demeaning, when the party became the subject of an investigation by the Equality and Human Rights Commission in response to accusations of ‘institutional’ (specifically anti-Semitic) racism.)

A similar scenario of denial and cover-up was played out in Manchester, as reported by the *Manchester Evening News* of January 29, 2020. In a story titled ‘Tensions simmer in Manchester town hall over who knew what about 2004 grooming paedophile gang’, it revealed that ‘alarmed [council] backbenchers have been asking questions internally of the city’s leadership about what was known of Operation Augusta itself and the abuse it has uncovered in 2004 and 2005.’ Operation Augusta was ‘the abandoned 2005 joint investigation into a massive [Muslim] south Manchester paedophile ring’ that had ‘revealed a series of shocking failures [sic] by police and social services.’

First, we had the Casey and Jay reports into Rotherham’s Muslim rape, quote, ‘industry’. But such was its scale, and the level of official collusion in its operations, that a third investigation was undertaken, this time by the Independent Office for Police [miss] Conduct. Released in June 2020, its findings were devastating. One of them was that girls aged 12 were deemed by police to have ‘consented’ to sex acts. Sexual intercourse with a girl under the age of 13 carries a maximum sentence of 14 years. Another was a detective sergeant describing a victim of gang rape as ‘worldly wise, not meek and mild.’ Police failed to investigate an older man who was discovered naked in a room with one of the victims. There were even no proceedings taken when a rapist handed over a missing girl to police for more sexual abuse as part of a deal not to arrest him. (I see no reason to doubt that this was a common practice...a police rape geld.) Police took no action after approaching a parked car and being told by a male occupant that he had just had a sex act performed on him by one of two girls in the car. A father of a girl who had been raped was told that she ‘might learn her lesson’, whatever that might by.

No disciplinary action was taken against any of the officers who had colluded in the mass rape of children. They were simply given written warnings and ‘words of advice’. Police were said to have ‘turned a blind’ eye’ to what was going under their noses, an ‘industrial scale’ sexual abuse of at least 1,400 children by

thousands of Muslim men, some in their fifties. Of the 35 men convicted of various offences connected with Rotherham's rape industry, all but two had Muslim names. But I have it on good authority (that of the Tories, Corbyn and the *Guardian* to name three) that perpetrators of the crimes for which they were convicted are distributed pretty much evenly across the UK's male population.

As in other locations where Muslim rape gangs were given free rein, responsible employees of Manchester's Labour Council, although like the police fully aware of their operations, not only did nothing to protect their vulnerable victims, to whom many, if not most, it owed a legal duty of care, but actively assisted their abusers. In one case, the most notorious, the same report, commissioned by the city's Labour Mayor, Andy Burnham, revealed that as far back as 2003, social workers knew a 15-year-old girl, Victoria Agoglia, was being sexually abused and forcibly injected with heroin, a standard practice of rape gangs to make the now-addicted victim submit to sexual slavery in return for more 'fixes'. Yet, incredibly, Victoria's rapists collected her 'in plain sight' of staff at the care (sic) home where she was staying. This was also a routine followed in other care homes, not just in Manchester but Rotherham and elsewhere, one which converted places of protection and care for vulnerable children into publicly-funded brothels providing rape fodder for the gratification of the animal appetites of depraved and sadistic, overwhelmingly Muslim paedophiles. And surely, given the extent of care home and council complicity necessarily involved in this combined operation, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that some of the vast revenues it generated (just one child could earn £100,000 a year for her pimp) found its way into the bank balances of those public employees who furnished the facilities and provided the sex slaves essential for the trade's functioning. As an example of the degree of their complicity in this lucrative 'joint enterprise', the same report revealed, even more incredibly, that 'a man identified as her [i.e., Victoria's] pimp was given permission to visit her in her accommodation three times a week'. This is rape facilitation pure and simple, and what is more, under-age rape. Yet as in all other identical cases, not a single prosecution for misconduct in public office, either of police, social workers, or council officials. And if there had been, those so accused could, some might say with a modicum of justice, have pleaded they were simply adhering to a policy emanating from the very highest levels.

Victoria died of a heroin overdose, injected by Mohammed (there's a surprise) Yaqoob, who at his trial, was nevertheless acquitted of manslaughter and instead sentenced to three and a half years on drugs charges. Labour councillor Sue Cooley, a leading social services officer at the time, and in charge of Operation Augusta, also wound up an investigation into the circumstances surrounding Victoria's death 'due to a lack of resources'. In her statement responding to the Burnham report, she said 'I wish that I had known more and been able to do more.' Yet she was the one who closed down two investigations, pleading lack of resources. Funding however was available to pay the salary of Pauline Newman, the Director of Child Services at the time of the cover-up of the Victoria Agoglia scandal, to the tune of £139,000 per annum, nearly double that of an MP, and only £3,500 less than the Prime Minister. And what she and her colleagues presided over may well have been even worse than just collusion in child rape. The *Manchester Evening News* of May 7, 2020, reported that 'a children's social care worker' had been arrested 'on suspicion of sexual activity with a child'. Once

again, I have to ask...where were the protests of the feminists and the metooers? Because surely here we see exposed patriarchy at its most predatory. I suspect that their silence is due to its having the wrong skin colour and religion.

Let us now look another location where again, for decades, the same public agencies looked the other way, and therefore effectively, if in not necessarily in every case illegally, colluded with a town's Muslim rape industry...Telford's in the West Midlands. The industry is known to have been in business no later than 1975, that is for more than forty years and, thanks to the supportive attitude of the police and other public officials, had reached a scale which, according to the Home Office, by 2015, was the highest of any town or city in the UK. No mean achievement, considering that Telford has a population of only 170,000, and of which only 3,000 are Muslims, and of that number no more than a thousand at most are males of rape age. As in Rotherham and Manchester, and of course elsewhere, nearly all their victims, some 1,000, were white and, we can be sure, mainly from working class and broken homes. Although Telford police were fully aware by no later than the early 1980s that children were being groomed, pimped and raped by Muslim men, they ignored it. It took another 20 years before seven men were charged and convicted of a range of sexual crimes. Each, *pace* Corbyn, had Muslim names, with three called Mohammed. Their ages ranged from 25 to 61. Seven convicted Muslims out of a total of hundreds of rapists, who over more than three decades, abused at least 1,000 victims, all of them children, received sentences amounting to no more than 54 and half years, with four only serving two and half years. In total, an average sentence of less than eight years, with every prospect of remission after serving only half the full term. The girls they abused however will be marked for life.

Not surprisingly, in view of its scale, the convictions had little or no impact on the town's rape industry, because it continued to thrive into the next decade and beyond, as was revealed by a *Sunday Mirror* investigation in 2018. As elsewhere, fear of accusations of racism was the excuse given for a lack of action against the rape gangs. West Mercia Police Chief Tom Harding, 'significantly disputed' the scale of the problem revealed by the *Mirror*. 'I don't believe Telford has a discernible [sic] problem compared to other towns' he told the *Shropshire Star*. 'Child exploitation will be taking place all over the country. [Correct, and for the same reasons as in Telford], and Telford is no different to anywhere else.' (Not so. Despite the strong competition, it was ranked worst in the UK.)

Just like Corbyn, a Tory government report on the subject and the *Guardian*, Harding denied there was any ethnic (and therefore religious) dimension to grooming and gang rape. 'Sexual offending across Telford and Wrekin is virtually identically proportionate to the breakdown of society.' Another lie. Muslim males comprised 1.7% of all Telford males. So, it follows that if what Harding (and we must not forget Corbyn, the *Guardian* and the Tories) says is correct, we would expect nearly all those convicted of pimping, trafficking grooming and gang rape of children in Telford, with a population that is 98% non-Muslim, to be...non-Muslims. Adding to the seven Muslims convicted in 2013 the three Telford men with Muslim names convicted of sexual offences against children in 2019 (one for rape, two named Mohammed and averaging a six-year sentence) we have in all ten Muslim men and no infidels convicted of these offences...100%, not 1.7%. Hardly Harding's (and Corbyn's) 'proportionate', one might say.

A report on the Telford's Muslim rape industry, issued in July 2022, as summarised by ITV, said the following: 'Key agencies [for which read, as in Rotherham, Manchester and elsewhere, the police, social services schools and the justice system] dismissed [sexual] exploitation as "child prostitution" [no less illegal than child rape], and child exploitation [ditto] was ignored.' 'Up to 1,000 girls, as young as 11, were gang-raped, trafficked, held at gun point, beaten and sold for sex.' 'Victims say they sought help from authorities but were left frightened after being told police could not [i.e., would not] help them. Some girls said they were raped by hundreds of men.' As always, we are told nothing as to the religious identity of these hundreds of rapists, but as we have seen, the names of those convicted are a helpful guide. As a footnote to the Telford story, it should be pointed out that on at least four occasions while he was Labour leader, Corbyn posted comments on matters pertaining to Telford, three of them describing his activities in the town. But not one even alluded to the orgy of sexual crimes being committed under his nose, which had by this time become public knowledge.

The same sordid story revealed itself in Oldham, another former mill town, with 18% of its population classified as Muslims. After decades of sexual abuse and exploitation of children by the town's Muslim rape industry, a report on its activities, and those that facilitated them, was released in July 2022. One specific case cited dating back to 2005 was that of 12-year-old Sophie (not her real name) who was repeatedly raped 'for hours' after she he had been turned away by police for being 'drunk'. The police were given the names of two of her rapists, but they declined to charge them. One of the two was later jailed for the attempted murder of his wife, but not for the rape of a 12-year white girl. When she reported her ordeal to Oldham Council child care staff, they accused of her of being 'prone to fantasies' and having chosen to 'put herself at risk.' Yet again, we see the same pattern: police collusion with social services to protect the rapists, and the same response to their victims, that, to quote the Home Office circular, being raped was an 'informed choice'. The fact that the scale and level of collusion, corruption and depravity of the child rape industry revealed in Manchester, Telford, Oldham and Rotherham were not unique to those four locations, combined with evidence that the Home Office under Labour authorised it, and under the Tories, suppressed the religious identity of its main perpetrators (a coyness shared by the *Manchester Evening News* description of the rapists as 'Asians') leads to but one conclusion.

Having eliminated local 'failings', the root causes boil down to three: firstly, a central government policy of the appeasement of Islam, decanted down to local various local authorities and agencies, that led to the sacrificing of underprivileged, non-voting young non-Muslim girls to organised Muslim rape gangs of voting age; secondly, 'political correctness' and genuine fear of accusations of racism and, third, on the part of the rape gangs, the teachings of Islam on the Allah-created inferiority of all women, and the even greater inferiority of non-Muslim women, in relation to Muslim men. This teaching, inscribed both in the *Koran* and in numerous *Hadith*, is sufficient, in the minds of its perpetrators, to justify and motivate, but not, on its own, to make possible the kinds of barbarities inflicted on non-Muslim girls not just in Rotherham, Telford, Oxford, Aylesbury and Sheffield, but wherever Muslim men have access to non-Muslim women, as in the ISIS occupied territories of the Middle East, or those controlled by Boko Haram in Nigeria. In order for the wish to become a reality, *those in power have*

to allow it. Hence the necessary relationship between causes one and three. Where those in power are themselves the rapists, as with the Jihadis of ISIS and Boko Haram, everything goes according to plan. But before Muslim men can have their Sharia way with *kuffar* women in non-Islamic countries, there has to be a special kind of facilitating factor in play that in its absence, would in any civilised country result in their conviction, receiving lengthy jail sentences and in the UK, entry onto the sex offenders register. And the reality is that in the UK, instead of such judicial actions, the green light for Muslim gang rape had indeed been provided by its public authorities and politicians with results in no way different from those in the Islamic State and north eastern Nigeria. It is those at the very summits of society, irrespective of political party, and beginning in the 1970s, who devised, initiated or approved the intensive indoctrination of public servants in 'cultural sensitivity' and 'community awareness', and authorised intensive compulsory courses of 'diversity training', all under the banner of multiculturalism, who are responsible for generating the political, cultural, ideological and moral climate that allowed these crimes to go unpunished for decades and, in doing so, blighting the lives of their victims.

The tragic results of this politically-correct brain-washing, what Mao Tse-tung called 'thought reform', go some way to explaining how the Nazis were able, in the space of a few years, to inculcate and then exploit a similar indifference by millions of Germans to the fate of the Jews. However, there is a difference in the two situations. Those few Germans who spoke out against (as distinct from declining to take part in) the extermination of the Jews knowingly risked losing their liberty and most likely, their lives in doing so. The worst that whistleblowers could expect in Rotherham or the other towns and cities where Muslims rape gangs freely operated was the loss of a job, social ostracism and accusations of racism. But, incredibly and shamefully, as the years rolled by and the rapes continued on an ever-expanding scale, there was silence and even collusion. And in situations where those who have the power to prevent a wrong do nothing, their silence conveys assent.

(*Inter alia*, I cannot at this point resist recalling an episode from my own career in academe, dating back to the mid-1980s, when the onslaught on Enlightenment values was already gathering its current vast momentum. I had been obliged, along with all my lecturer colleagues, to attend a day-long seminar of totalitarian mind bending on the need for 'racial awareness' in education, a state of mind, one would have thought, more fitting for those attending a Nuremberg rally, a Ku Klux Klan convention or a pro-Apartheid demonstration in South Africa. (as we shall see, it was Hitler who was almost certainly the first to use this very same phrase.) Utterly bored and not a little disgusted with the proceedings, I idly leafed through the booklet that accompanied the event, only to discover, much to my amusement, that I, along with every other white person in the room except the (white) instructor, was a hardened and probably incurable racist, the reason being that the number and varieties of racism listed were so all-encompassing they covered almost every possible thought anyone could have on the subject. Which was of course, and was intended to be, grist to the mill of the then burgeoning 'anti-racist' industry. The version which I, without knowing it, was practising in my academic career was described, perfectly accurately, as the 'colour blind' approach in which the educator does their level best to pay no heed to the skin colour (or the gender for that matter) of who is being taught, and

instead focuses on stimulating and imparting knowledge to their colourless minds. Many years later, I had confirmation of my guilt in an article by a Dr Monnica Williams for *Psychology Today*, that 'treating people as individuals as equally as possible, without regard to race, culture or ethnicity' was indeed 'a form of racism'.

As this publicly funded lunacy (for such it surely was) ground uselessly on, a colleague sitting near me, sensing that my detachment was evidence of my disapproval of the proceedings, turned to me and in a low voice said, 'all this makes me realise how right George Orwell was'. Need one say more? Were he with us today Orwell would have also had confirmed his worst fears about the future of western civilisation by the adoption of newspeak at one of the UK's top educational institutions, the academic madhouse that goes by the name of Goldsmiths College, one which had advertised one of its courses for teachers as being for the purpose of raising Hitler's 'racial awareness'. In April of the year 2015, an event convened by the 'racial aware' students union to promote 'diversity' did so by banning from attendance all male and non-black women students. The college 'Diversity [sic] Officer', a certain Bahar Mustafa, who had tweeted the Third Wave feminist war cry, 'kill all men', and who in appearance at least was certainly not 'black', announced in flawless wokespeak that 'this meeting is for all self-defining [sic] BLACK and ETHNIC MINORITY women and non-binary [sic] people with gender identities that include "women".' (note the emphases, and the quotation marks around 'women'.) If 'self-defining' is taken to mean what it means, it would seem that skin colour, like gender, is not in the genes, but in the mind, or as post-modernism would have it, is a 'social construct' that can presumably be modified at will, as in the case of Bahar Mustafa, to suit the occasion. It should give us pause for thought that not only lunacies such as this can be indulged at public expense, but that those who promote and take part in them will hold positions of influence and even authority in British society in the not-too-distant future.)

Returning to the main theme, there is another question that has to be asked, and answered, however much the Islamophiles may dislike what that answer is. Where and how have so many Muslim men (and the combined number of rapists and pimps, we have been informed, runs into the thousands) learned to treat girls and women habitually in ways that not only place them beyond the moral boundaries of civilisation, but the human race? Although the vast majority of these biologically quite normal but culturally sub-human sub-savages were born and raised in the UK, they were being described in such cases as of 'Pakistani heritage', as if that was the explanation for their behaviour rather than their religion, ignoring the fact that some of the convicted perpetrators had been Muslims from three continents: Albania, Kuwait, Morocco, Sudan, Bangladesh, Somalia, Turkey, Kurdistan, Palestine, Iraq, Iran and Syria. The number of Christian 'Asians' in Pakistan is currently 2.5 million, and of Hindus 3 million. Are they to be tarred with the same racist brush? But of course, even now, when 'political correctness' has at last been blamed for the decades of public authorities' refusal to confront and deal with the issue, it still continues, because nothing is said of the root cause of their behaviour, which is neither one of race or nation, but the great unmentionable, *religion*.

Not only in Rotherham but in nearby Sheffield, a rape and pimping gang of at least 320 men also operated with impunity, abusing at least 200 young girls.

According to an ex-police officer, parents of the victims were silenced by death threats and the victims themselves by holding kettles of boiling water over them. One girl *had her tongue nailed to a table* to deter her from informing on her on her pimps and rapists, and another girl aged 12, had her foetus aborted by a *claw hammer rammed into her vagina*. When the same police officer volunteered to create a special unit to combat the rape gangs, he was told by a senior officer, 'it's not going to happen. Return to your districts.' This instruction was official, if not publicised, Home Office policy. A member of the Oxford rape gang branded a girl on the buttocks with the first letter of his name which just happened to be Mohammed. All this and more happened in England, not the Islamic State. Whatever else may be said about the police, by refusing to take any action against these barbarians, at least it ensured they could not be accused of Islamophobia.

This was nowhere truer than in Hull, where its police fought a last-ditch rearguard battle against the tide of Muslim rape prosecutions sweeping through the rest of Yorkshire. Towards the end of November 2021, Sky News revealed that the city's police had wound up an investigation into organised sexual abuse of young girls, claiming that there was insufficient evidence to warrant further action. Sky News had seen some of this evidence, which included texted threats to burn alive a young girl if she refused to be raped regularly by a gang of men. A girl described being tied to a radiator while wearing her school uniform and being raped by a man in his sixties, while another girl was raped by eight men while unconscious. The girls described their rapists as of Asian and Middle Eastern appearance...in other words, Muslims.

Despite victims reporting the names of their rapists to the police, some 30 in all, after being interviewed, no action was taken against them. In the words of Hull's Detective Chief Superintendent Philip Ward, 'Critically, the investigation found no evidence of organised child sexual exploitation in any part of our community, either geographically or through ethnicity'... just like Telford, and just as Corbyn, the Tories, and the *Guardian* said. Hear no Muslim rape, see no Muslim rape, believe no Muslim rape, so investigate and prosecute no Muslim rape. After a girl named her abusers to the police, she immediately received death threats from those she had named, *the police having tipped them off*. All this and much more had been verified by Sky News. At the same time, the BBC reported that Rotherham's rape industry, despite a number of convictions, was still in business, while across south Yorkshire, four police authorities were still stubbornly refusing to change their multi-cultural ways, failing, as was now required, to identify child sex traffickers and rapists by their ethnicity, which explained nothing, but not their religion, which in the vast majority of cases, accounted for a great deal.

In Rotherham, and other town and cities not only throughout the UK, but Scandinavia, decades of multi-culturalism and political correctness have combined with Islamic teachings on the inferiority of women to create an open season for the treatment of young non-Muslim girls as prostitutes and rape fodder or, as the *Koran* has it, 'booty'. The *Koran* is quite explicit concerning the permissibility of what amounts to the possession and rape of non-Islamic women, and no amount of 'contextualisation' can make it say and mean other than what it says and means: 'And all married women are forbidden unto you save those captives whom your right hand possesses'. (Chapter 4, Verse 24) The meaning here is obvious. Other Muslims' wives, being the property of their husbands, you

cannot touch. But infidel 'captive' women, including wives, are fair game. It is easy to see how this Koranic teaching came to be applied in a necessarily modified form in the UK, as in other countries of the Muslim diaspora. In theory, at least, no raping of Muslim women or other Muslim men's wives (raping one's own is of course entirely another matter) but also, in infidel lands, because of the risks involved, not as a rule of non-Muslim wives either. By a process of elimination, that left infidel single girls, the younger and the more vulnerable the better. Let the exponents of 'contextualisation' explain away the 'surface' meaning of this Koranic verse sanctifying the treatment of such 'slave girls' as nothing but sexual 'booty': 'Prophet, we have made it lawful to you the wives you have granted dowries *and the slave girls whom God has given you as booty*'. (Chapter 33, Verse 50, emphasis added) And the prophet, being perfect, is to be emulated in all things by devout Muslims, as we have seen in Rochdale, Rotherham, Keighley, Halifax, Aylesbury, Oxford, Telford and Sheffield and a score or more of other towns and cities across the UK.

As a series of spectacular trials has proven beyond all doubt, over at least the last four decades, tens, probably even hundreds of thousands of *kuffar* girls have been in effect taken 'captive' and treated as 'booty' by Muslim (not 'Asian') rape gangs and reduced to a state of abject sexual servitude. And whatever the Islamophiles might say, the *Koran* permits it. Anthropologists will tell us that most, if not all traditional, essentially tribal-based cultures practised the kidnapping and rape of the women of enemy tribes. And this indeed is the case. As recently as the 1990s, for all the denials of Corbyn, Serbian militiamen murdered the husbands of thousands of Croatian and Muslim Bosnian women, who were then gang raped as the (in this case Christian Orthodox) spoils of war. This ancient but still surviving custom of treating women prisoners as sex slaves is indeed sanctified not only by the *Koran*, but the Old Testament of the Bible, from which much of the *Koran* has been clumsily cribbed. In fact, the Bible not only justifies these practices, but commands them. Deuteronomy Chapter 20 is here quite explicit: '...thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword. But the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil [sic] thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself.' (Verses 13 and 14) Chapter 21 goes into more detail:

[T]he Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands and though hast taken them captive. And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire for her to be thy wife; then thou shall bring her home to thine house...and she shall remain in thine house and bewail her father and mother a full month: and after that thou shall go in unto her [sic!], and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. (Verses 10-11)

Irrespective of what Obama might say to the contrary, for we can easily imagine him claiming, in response to accusations of Islamic abuse of females, that 'no religion condones the rape of women', this is Biblically-sanctioned Boko Haram or ISIS-style abduction and rape, pure and simple. However, whatever their holy book might tell them to do, Jews don't do it now and have not been in a position to do so since the Roman conquest of Palestine in 63 BC, though Christians in the Balkans have as recently as the 1990s. Muslims, whether it is Boko Haram, ISIS, or the rape gangs of Rotherham and forty or more cities and towns across the UK,

still do. Those in authority, including police, social workers, school teachers, and politicians, both Muslim and infidel, have found this abuse by Muslim men of young non-Muslim girls, organised in many cases 'on an industrial scale' (1,400 girls in Rotherham alone) and capable of generating an annual income for pimping just one girl of £100,000 and more, quite acceptable, possibly in some cases lucrative, and have ignored or connived at it and even, in the case of Rotherham at least, participated in the abuse themselves. And when, after decades of denial, it was finally exposed, it was invariably blamed on 'Asians', a racist slur if ever there was one.

Taking 'Asian' to mean the peoples of the Indian sub-continent, and not those of the rest of Asia such the 'Orientals' of China, Korea, Japan, the Malayan Peninsula and Indo-China, out of a total of 1.8 billion 'Asians', just over a quarter, 480 million, are Muslims, while under a third of the world's Muslims, totalling in 2017 1.5 billion, are 'Asians'. Such is the respect political correctness pays to facts. Even more to the point, no evidence has been produced that diaspora 'Asian' Hindus, Sikhs, Jainists, Christians and Buddhists are in the same business of gang rape and pimping. While the names of those who were convicted leave no doubt whatsoever as to their religious identity, the nearest the Jay report came to identifying the Rotherham rape gangs was to describe them as men of 'Pakistani heritage'. This explains and defines nothing, as not all Pakistanis are Muslims, while all the convicted rapists were and what is more, proud to be so, on hearing their sentence, crying out, *Allahu Akbar*, God is Great. One of their number demonstrated his devoutness when, according to evidence given to police and then ignored, he 'raped with a broken bottle' one of his victims, and ordered a girl he had been raping to 'kiss the perpetrator's feet at gun point'.

The police took all this in their stride. Nothing out of the ordinary. It was a routine matter. One rape victim was offered the following advice by an officer of the law: 'Don't worry - you aren't the first to be raped by XX and you won't be the last.' The *Oxford Mail* reported how gang rapists...all Muslims... had 'scratched, choked, beaten, gang raped, burnt' their victims and sexually assaulted with '*knives and a baseball bat*'. One described how she had 'turned up at the police station at 2 or 3 AM, blood all over me, soaked through my trousers to the crotch. They dismissed me as being naughty, a nuisance. I was bruised and bloody.' This was the reaction to child rape by an English police officer, not of a tribal elder in the Pakistan or Afghan outback, and in a UK where the same officer had the power to arrest anyone who dared to publicly speak the truth about the religion that made these crimes possible. (Yes...this happens. See Chapter 28) Of one thing we can be absolutely sure. Had the roles been reversed, with 'infidel' rape gangs pimping young Muslim girls, as the SWP alleged, it would not have taken thirty years before the perpetrators were identified, apprehended, charged, tried, convicted and punished. Why do Muslim rapists mainly use white English girls for their pleasures? For the Muslim male, young Muslim girls, being the property of their male relatives and destined, unless they are raped by an older male relative, to stay virgins until marriage are, officially at least, off limits. That is why it is generally accepted as being open season so far as non-Muslim girls are concerned. No such latitude however is allowed to Muslim females, again as recent tragic cases have demonstrated. Marriage, or any kind of romantic relationship with a *kuffar*, is *haram*. Muslim girls are chattels, to be FGM'd, and then married or even sold off within the clan, sometimes to a much older relative who seeks a new,

younger additional wife and is ready to pay the going rate. So, should a young Muslim female choose to ungratefully reject the marital future mapped out for her by family and, worse again, be suspected of forming a genuine romantic attachment to an infidel young male, exemplary retribution is called for, usually carried out by the girl's family. By possibly first raping, and then murdering the errant daughter, the violated honour of the family, in the first place its males, can be restored in the eyes of the clan and the 'close knit, vibrant community'.

There is ample evidence that, as in the cases of organised Muslim gang rape and pimping, the customary blind eye has been turned by public authorities towards Islamic 'honour killings'. Whether this is due to a politically correct desire to preserve at all costs harmonious 'community relations', or is motivated by a racist and sexist indifference to the plight of young Muslim females is hard to tell, since both lead to the same result...'none of our business'. What we do know of what is officially called 'honour violence' is believed to be but a glimpse of a much larger and still growing aspect of a young woman's lot in the Islamic 'community'. The scale of this species of Islamic male violence on women can be appreciated by the fact that in 2011 alone, the number of 'honour violence' incidents *recorded* by 37 of the UK's 52 police forces was 2,823. And since then, the number has continued to rise. *Hadith*-sanctioned female genital mutilation (inflicted on as many as 130,000 Muslim girls in the UK with, thus far, only one successful prosecution), *Koran*-sanctioned wife-beating, 'honour killing' and *Koran*-sanctioned marital rape and forced and child marriage constitute a pattern of life, and of death, for Muslim women that we in the West have knowingly allowed to take root and flourish almost unchecked and, what is worse, in the name of 'tolerance', 'cultural diversity and sensitivity' and good 'community relations'. And those who should be protesting the loudest, the feminists, are silent. Because there is the glass ceiling and the white patriarchy.

I say 'the West', because the UK is far from being the only country where infidel girls and women have been the preferred victims of rape by Muslim men, only in most cases, they are not of the 'Pakistani heritage' that the Jay report, studiously eschewing a religious cause, wrongly implied explained their behaviour in Rotherham. Sweden, before the onset of mass Muslim immigration, was among the safest, if not the safest, country for women anywhere in the world. Then, with a surge in Muslim migration, it was on the way to becoming one vast Rotherham. Back in 1975, the year in which Sweden, with the very best of intentions, decided to become an official 'multicultural society', the number of recorded rapes was 421. By 2014, it had soared to 6,620, an increase of 1472%. As a result, Sweden had a rape rate of 53.2 rapes per 100,000 of the population, *second in the world only to Lesotho*, at 91.6. Inevitably, all manner of bogus, politically correct explanations were forthcoming to divert attention from the principal cause of this unprecedented surge in rapes, the main one proffered being that more women were now prepared to report it. This of course could account for part of the increase, but only a small fraction, for we are looking at here is a 14-fold increase. One young man interviewed by the Swedish Daily *DN* summed up the attitude of his fellow male Muslims towards rape. He is describing his feelings about Swedish women, but it could just as easily be working class white girls in Rochdale, Halifax, Keighley, Rotherham, Oxford, Sheffield or Aylesbury:

It's not as wrong to rape a Swedish girl as an Arab girl. The Swedish girl gets a lot of help afterwards, and she's probably been fucked already. But the Arab girl will get problems with her family. For her it is a great shame to be raped. It is important that she retains her virginity when she marries...I do not have much [sic] respect for Swedish girls. You could say they get fucked till they are broken.

Swedish women were to be treated by Muslim men as rape fodder...barely human, one degree down from Muslim girls, who were valuable as chattels. In seeking an explanation for the soaring rape rate, the one factor studiously ignored by most Swedish commentators was that the increase in reported rapes coincided exactly with the parallel surge in Muslim immigration, one that was partly responsible for a 2 million increase in Sweden's population from 1975 to 2020. Of Sweden's total population of 10.2 million, today around 800,000 are Muslims, 8%. This percentage is set to increase, as it is in many other European countries, and not only through continued immigration. While the net reproduction rate of native Swedes is below 1, with Muslims, it is well above 1. Multiculturalists, confronted with this unprecedented increase in rape might, as a last resort, want to believe that native Swedish men, from being the world's most respectful of a woman's right to say no, have suddenly turned into the world's second worst sexual predators. They might want to, but no-one else is going to believe it. Though hard to come by, Sweden's rape statistics show that a rapist is ten times more likely to be of foreign extraction than a native Swede, even though native Swedes comprise around 90% of the total population. At least 70% of rapes in Sweden are perpetrated by males belonging to the 8% of the population who are Muslims; a ratio that indicates that when it comes to rape, as with other crimes, Muslim males were performing what is known technically as 'heavy lifting'. (See Appendix C) The same trends in rape statistics, accompanied and for sure caused by similar patterns of Muslim immigration, have also been recorded in Denmark and Norway and more recently, thanks to Merkel, Germany. Again, it must be stressed, we are looking at the impact of a culture and a religion, not the behaviour of a race or races. While UK Muslim rape gangs are described as usually 'of Pakistani heritage', Sweden's Muslim rapists originate from a totally different ethnic background, being either from Africa (mainly Somalia) Afghanistan or the Middle East. So what they each have in common is not 'ethnicity' or a place of origin, but a misogynistic religion that sanctions the rape of non-Muslim females. In its dealings with Muslim immigrants, Sweden has had a rougher ride than most European countries, mainly because of its world-renowned tradition of toleration, pluralism and openness, principles that Muslims despise in their own countries but are only too ready to exploit in everybody else's. (See Appendix C)

Though reluctant at best to confront Muslim anti-social and criminal behaviour at home, especially rape, in Sweden's external relations with the Muslim world, everything has its limits, as the Saudi Kingdom discovered. The Swedish government, a left-wing coalition, marked International Women's Day of March 8, 2015, by sending its Foreign Minister, the Social Democrat Margot Wallstrom, to a session of the Arab League convened in Cairo. The speech she was due to make on March 9 was never given because, briefed as to its contents, the newly-crowned and western bootlicked King Salman pulled rank and denied her the right to speak. The usual Muslim 'offence' had been taken to the following passage in her censored address: '

Human rights are a priority in Swedish foreign policy. Freedom of association, assembly, religion and expression are not only fundamental rights and important tools in the creation of vibrant societies. They are indispensable in the fight against extremism and radicalisation. So is a vibrant civil society.

King Salman rightly saw this a barely veiled (no pun intended) attack on his own misogynistic feudal despotism, and also as being totally at odds with the definition of Islamic 'human rights' adopted at the OIC summit in Cairo in 1990. Obviously at his instigation, the Arab League issued a justification of its silencing of the Swedish Minister. Her statement was 'irresponsible' [but to whom?] and unacceptable' (but not it, seems, untrue). Obviously and intentionally, Wallstrom had struck a raw nerve; because the statement went on to specifically rebut her implied criticism of the Saudi regime. The kingdom was 'based on the Sharia' (true), 'defended the rights of the people' (which famously did not include the right of a woman to drive a car) and 'safeguarded their blood [frequently shed at public beheadings and floggings], wealth [concentrated in the Swiss bank accounts of the Saudi Royal family] and honour [as in honour killings]'. On March 10, the Swedish government unilaterally terminated its contract to supply arms to Saudi Arabia. The next day, the Saudi Kingdom recalled its ambassador. Petro-Islamic blackmail works, but so does calling its bluff.

Addendum: Spoils of War

As we have seen, both Corbyn and the long-awaited government (and much redacted) report on the subject insisted there was no particular religious or ethnic dimension to organised sex crime involving the trafficking and rape of under-age girls. They would have liked to persuade an increasingly sceptical public, without offering any statistical evidence to substantiate it, that its perpetrators were distributed pretty much evenly across all 'communities', be they religious or ethnic. Let us look then at some typical high-profile cases predating the report and following it, and see how that claim stands up to the evidence.

In 2016, 18 men from Halifax and Bradford were found guilty of raping under-age girls and other sexual offences. All but one had Muslim names. In February 2019, as part of the same investigation, nine more men from the same locations were found guilty of rape and other offences involving children. Once again, all but one had Muslim names. In December 2019, also as part of the same investigation, another 16 men from Halifax were charged with child rape and trafficking, that is, pimping, under-age girls, one of those so charged at the time of the offences being a serving police officer. And yet again, all but one had Muslim names. Police believed that as many as a hundred men from the same areas could have been involved in the same crimes. The most recent cases involved firstly charges of the rape of a 13-year-old girl brought against 29, repeat, 29 men, again, all from Yorkshire, this time, *every one with a Muslim name*. Finally, the fifth case, yet again in Yorkshire, where at Leeds magistrates court on November 29, 2021, 39 men were charged with the rape of six young girls over a period of twenty years. And again, *all 39 had Muslims names*, 13, one third, being Mohammed. I will not include a sixth case, that of 16 men, aged between 33 and 60, once again hailing from Labour MP Naz Shah's patch, Bradford, who were arrested in December 2021 on charges of sexual offences relating to one female in

the period between 2002 and 2009, the reason being that their names were not published. Nevertheless, I am confident that if they are charged with the said offences, their names will once again give the lie to claims that organised sex trafficking and gang rape are spread evenly across ‘all communities’.

In these five cases, of the 111 men charged with or convicted of sexual offences with a child, *only three did not have Muslim names*...and even one or more of these three could have been converts, as has proved to be the case in other trials. I can assure the reader that had I chosen at random a dozen or more other similar trials and cases, the result would have been the same, or so nearly so as to make no difference. The evidence is overwhelming, the conclusion irrefutable...that is, for those who go by the court records, and not politically correct wishful thinking. Organised, or to quote the Jay Report, ‘industrial scale’ child rape and pimping is *exclusively* a Muslim business. Yet, there are those who, like Corbyn and the Tories, would like to convince the public otherwise. Saba Kaiser, with the job description of ‘ethnic minority ambassador to the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse’, claimed that child sexual abuse ‘doesn’t have a religion, it doesn’t have a culture’. When it comes to ‘industrial scale’ child rape, which is what she was specifically referring to, it most certainly does. And that ‘culture’ is an Islamic one, as the statistics cited above and below prove. Writing in the *Guardian* (again I ask, ‘where else?’) Ella Cockbain and Waqus Tufail said that ‘the two-year study of the Home Office makes very [sic] clear there are no [sic] grounds for asserting that Muslim or Pakistani heritage men are disproportionately engaged in such crimes...’ ‘No evidence’? The Casey and Jay reports say the exact opposite, as do the court records of those convicted of ‘such crimes’. Let us ‘do the math’.

Muslim men comprise approximately 4% of all men in the UK. In the five typical cases I have cited, Muslim men comprised 97% of those either charged with or convicted for the sexual offences specified above. Muslim men are therefore over-represented in the cases cited by a factor of 22. Non-Muslim men, who comprise 96% of the UK male population, account for the remaining 3% of such cases, *underrepresented* by a factor of 33. Give that these statistics are representative of all such cases...and again, I can assure the reader that they are - we arrive at the following conclusion, one that differs more than somewhat from the lies told by Saba Kaiser, Corbyn, the Socialist Workers Party, the *Guardian* and the Tories concerning the incidence of Muslim gang rape: a Muslim man is approximately 700 times more likely to be charged with the grooming, trafficking and gang raping of children than a non-Muslim man.

Next, I wish to place here on record the details, in so far as they have entered the public domain, of two tragic cases intimately connected with Muslim sexual abuse of white girls, the first being the murder of Charlene Downes. When aged 14, she disappeared in her home town of Blackpool on November 1, 2003. Last seen near a number of fast-food outlets, a police investigation concluded that she had been murdered within hours of her last sighting. In the course of the investigation, it came to light that Charlene was one of around 60 white, mainly working-class girls in Blackpool who were being groomed and pimped for sex by and for men known to be Muslims. After a lengthy investigation, two Muslim men stood trial in May 2017 for her murder; namely, Iyad Albattikhi, the owner of a fast-food outlet, and his business partner, Mohammed Reveshi who, together with Albattikhi, was accused of disposing of her body by dismembering it and

serving up her flesh as kebab. Reveshi was also accused of having illegal underage sex with Charlene.

After the jury failed to reach a verdict, it was revealed that one of the jury members knew one of the two men on trial. Other members of the jury had been subjected to intimidation. There was also the possibility that some thought the details of the case too horrific to be true. A second trial was cancelled on the grounds of errors allegedly committed in the course of the investigation, and the two accused were released and awarded £250,000 each for wrongful arrest. The police officer found guilty of misconduct in the course of the investigation was asked to resign, but on appeal, the Police Arbitration Tribunal overturned the ruling. She in turn sued the police authority for £500,000 for defamation. The case remains unsolved, with a police reward of £100,000 for information leading to the conviction of Charlene's killer or killers.

It was a series of demonstrations in Blackpool by the English Defence League that finally publicly exposed the religious issues surrounding the murder of Charlene Downes, issues that had hitherto been either ignored, or obfuscated by racial references to Pakistanis and 'Asians'. The thanks the EDL got for doing so was to be accused of racism, even though the EDL had a multi-racial membership and was only opposed, like millions of UK citizens of all races and political dispositions, to the negative influence of Islam on British society, not to individual Muslims, whatever their race. This was just one of many instances where race and religion were quite deliberately conflated to brand criticism of Islam as racist.

The second tragedy was the 'honour killing' of Laura Wilson, murdered in Rotherham when 17 by a Muslim man described as her 'boyfriend', Ashtiaq Asghar, in October 2010. Laura had a four-month-old daughter by a friend of Asghar so, driven by jealousy, Asghar lured her to the side of a canal and after wounding her with a knife, threw her in the water and left her to drown. Sentencing Asghar at his trial for murder, the presiding judge said Asghar treated white girls as 'sexual targets' and not as human beings. He was not born with that racist attitude. Need one ask where he learned it from? It was subsequently revealed that like so many white working-class girls with Muslim 'boy friends', for which read pimps, Laura had been in the care, for what it was worth, of no fewer than 15 different Rotherham Social Services departments who, a report said, missed 'numerous' opportunities to protect her. Social services managers disagreed, claiming her death could not have been prevented.

So what were the staff of these 15 social service departments doing, apart from drawing their in many cases, grossly inflated salaries? Instead of admitting responsibility for the death of a vulnerable girl in their care, and ensuring that nothing like it happened again, Rotherham social services mounted a rearguard operation to clear their names. Already that same year, one private report on the sexual abuse of girls in Rotherham, more concerned with combatting a spurious white racism than protecting children in their care from all too real 'Asian' racist predators, claimed that 'although the alleged [sic!] perpetrators are of Asian origin [as always, not Muslim] and the victims are white, this is the factuality[sic] of these cases alone, nothing more can be [i.e., should be] drawn from that. It is imperative [sic] that suggestions/allusions of a wider cultural phenomenon are avoided. These assertions are without foundation.' (As we have seen, of the Yorkshire cases listed above, 97% involved Muslims)

In 2011, in the wake of the scandal surrounding Laura's murder, the authors of a report produced by Rotherham's Safeguarding Children Board (sic) were still insisting firstly that 'children are generally [sic] safe within the [Rotherham] community' (Rotherham child rape victims were already over 1,000 and counting), and secondly that in so far as the organised sexual exploitation of children existed in society in general, it was 'crucial to recognize that just as the ethnic identity of the perpetrators differs across the UK, so does that of the children.' The first claim is true, in so far as some of them were not 'Asians' or Pakistanis but Arabs and Africans. But they were nearly all Muslims. So once again, and we can be sure deliberately, the focus is shifted away from religion to race. The second claim is a lie, as proved to be so in Rotherham, where all the victims were white. Obviously concerned to paint a picture of sexual trafficking and grooming that was remote from the real situation that obtained in Rotherham, the Report continued: 'It is important that we do not allow [sic] a stereotype to develop, i.e., it is not just Asian men who commit this crime, nor are the victims only white.' Yet it was precisely in Rotherham that the perpetrators were all 'Asian', to be precise, Pakistanis - and the victims all white, facts the authors of the report must surely have been aware of. They said they had taken 'great care' to 'ensure that its findings embrace Rotherham's qualities of diversity'...in other words, these 'findings' were not 'findings' at all, but rather pre-determined politically correct fictions invented to produce a report that concealed the specifically religious nature of Rotherham's child rape industry which, far from being 'diverse', was an exclusively Muslim concern, just as its victims were exclusively white. (Here again we have Corbyn's take on the Irving Berlin song 'everybody's doing it'.)

Not by accident or oversight, the words 'Muslim' and Islam' do not occur once in the entire 145-page (much redacted) Report, yet the UK's rape industry would not exist but for the impact on Muslim men of the teachings of Islam on the status of non-Muslim woman and the role model of Mohammed in matters sexual, whom Islamic sources say raped the captive wives of non-Muslim men as his 'spoils of war', and consummated his marriage with his last wife when she was nine years old. Seeing that the *Koran* sanctions marital rape - 'your wives are a sort of tilth for you, so approach your tilth as and when you like.' (Chapter 22, Verse 223) - and Sharia law sets no lower age limit on sexual intercourse for girls, raping *kuffar* English children is no big deal. What more proof do we need that the UK's gang rape industry was born of a culturally inherited misogynist theology, not biologically inherited genes?

Only with the publication of an investigation in 2011 by the *Times* journalist Andrew Norfolk did Muslim grooming, trafficking and gang rape of English children become an issue that had to be taken seriously by those agencies whose responsibility it had been to expose and combat it, but had chosen not to do so. Even then, Rotherham Council, the main focus of Norfolk's inquiry, attempted to initiate criminal proceedings against him for revealing damning evidence of its collusion with the town's Muslim rape industry. These defensive tactics continued on September 9, 2014, when a House of Commons Select Committee (its proceedings can be seen on YouTube, and its findings on-line) questioned South Yorkshire police and Rotherham council officials as to their role in and knowledge of the scale of sex trafficking and abuse in the borough. Committee members were met with little else but evasions, feigned memory lapses and lies. After claiming

to have conducted himself properly in his two roles as a former Rotherham Councilor in charge of children's services, and at the time of the interview, a Labour South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner with special responsibilities for child protection, Shaun Wright was asked, in the light of his abject failure to live up to his job descriptions, 'what exactly will it take for you to resign?' Wright repeatedly claimed to have not been aware of criminal activities by police serving directly under him, which included the protection of Muslim child rapists.

The question was put to the serving Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police, David Crompton: 'Last week I asked you about the case of an eleven [yes, eleven] year old girl, and having said she had been sexually abused, was found a few weeks later in a derelict house with a number of adult males, yet she was arrested for being drunk and disorderly. I asked you about a 12-year-old girl who had sex with up to five men and the police officer said this had been one hundred per cent consensual in every incident. [Implying, it would seem, that he had been witness to all five rapes]. And I asked you about two fathers who tried to rescue their daughters from being abused and they were arrested themselves. Have you looked into any of this? Do you know who the police officers were?' It transpired that 'the main officer involved in the case had retired some years ago.' Crompton confirmed that a Rotherham police officer had been charged with a sexual offence against a girl of 15. So the police were also 'at it'....one suspects free of charge, in return for their complicity. Corrupt police do not do favours for nothing.

The Telford father of a sexually abused thirteen-year-old girl presented damning and compelling evidence on a YouTube video (*Justice for Amy*) that a rape gang had been paying protection money to the local force. After tracking his daughter to a rape premises in a block of flats, and taking her to a hospital to establish medical proof of rape, his daughter was interviewed by the police. They accused her of lying, claiming that she had consented to sexual intercourse, as per the already cited Home Office instruction to police authorities. This was standard procedure in rape gang cases, even though allegedly consensual sex with a minor is still a crime, and police are therefore obliged to investigate it. But they refused. When his daughter's phone was handed over to the police as evidence, it was smashed into six pieces and returned in a box marked 'No examination carried out'. (The video shows the box with its marking and the smashed phone.) Largely through his own efforts, the child's father established that 15 men from the same extended Muslim family had raped his daughter. One of them was prepared to pay £15,000 for the aborted fetus he had fathered in a rape. The girl's father personally witnessed a large brown envelop stuffed with bank notes being handed over in a restaurant by a rape gang member to a man whom he later encountered in a police station...a serving, high ranking officer. Considering the vast revenues generated by the Muslim rape industry, and that not only in Telford, but nearly everywhere else, this industry was allowed to thrive with impunity over decades, we can be sure that Telford's was not the only force on the take.

A description of some of the abuse young girls had been subjected to was read out to Crompton's predecessor, Meredydd Hughes. Children 'were raped by multiple perpetrators, trafficked to other towns in the north of England [courtesy of Rotherham's Muslim cab industry], abducted, beaten...children had been doused in petrol and threatened to be set alight, threatened with guns, made to witness brutally violent rapes and threatened they would be next if they told

anyone. Girls as young as eleven were raped by large numbers of male perpetrators.' When these crimes were reported to police, their response, repeating exactly, perhaps not by chance, the wording of the circular issued to all police authorities by the Home Office during the tenure of Labour's Jacqui Smith, was to say that an eleven-year-old girl being gang raped by Muslim men was 'an informed choice'. Asked if he was aware of these crimes being perpetrated on his watch and facilitated by his own officers, Hughes still insisted he had not been 'derelict in my duty', because 'if I had been aware of them, I would have dealt them, because they are criminal acts.' But unfortunately, like Manuel in *Faulty Towers*, he knew nothing. And so Rotherham's rape industry continued to prosper, with more than a little help from its protectors in blue. Hughes' evidence was deemed 'totally unconvincing'. In other words, he was lying.

His colleague, Police Commissioner Wright, was told that a girl who had been a victim of Rotherham's rape industry (one of at least 1,400) claimed she had described to him at a social event 'what I had to do to three Pakistani men in the back of a car', and that 'names were named'. But, 'we never saw him [Wright] again'. When asked if he recalled the encounter, Wright replied that he was 'pretty sure' that if he had that 'conversation', he would have remembered it. Wright was then told that one girl who had been present at the event in question was 'prepared to swear that you were there'. Wright again insisted he was not present at the event, a barbecue for sex abuse victims. None of the Select Committee members believed him and indeed said so. One told him, 'I have attended thousands of committees and sub-committees, but you are the least credible witness I have ever come across. I don't believe what you are saying.... you are a charlatan who is in love with your office and your salary, and you are a disgrace.' The chair of the Committee asked him to resign, which a matter of days later, he did. Mark this: In the course of the hearing, it was revealed that Rotherham police officers committed criminal acts to frustrate an investigation into the town's rape industry. Files containing damning evidence of police collusion in child sexual abuse were removed overnight from a safe, and two police officers made scarcely veiled death threats against an outside investigator into the same matter.

Joyce Thacker, Director of Rotherham's Children's Services in the period under review (salary, £130,000 per annum) cut no less a wretched figure than the other witnesses, lying and dissembling throughout her testimony. She attributed the failure of her staff to identify the ethnic origins of child abusers to 'fear of raising the issue' in case they were accused of racism, in all probability, by her, their boss. As a result, children were ignored by her department when they reported cases of sexual abuse by Pakistani men. Two members of her staff who tried to secure action on this issue were told to, quote, 'shut up'. Thacker described the prosecution of child rapists as 'the icing on the cake'. But it was she who ensured there was no cake.

Addressing this issue, the Jay Report on child sexual abuse in Rotherham said that child protection staff 'remembered clear direction from their managers' not to identify the race of sexual offenders. At every level, in every agency, the same political correctness ruled. Thacker was the recipient of a 2006 Home Office report on the links between drug, gun (sic!) and sex trafficking and the sexual abuse of young girls in Rotherham. One of the Committee quoted from it: 'Sexual exploitation was very organised, with systematic physical and sexual violence against young women [in fact, young girls], and involved young women being

trafficked to other towns and cities predominately in the north, which involved a level of intimidation, physical beatings and rape...' Thacker never acted on that report, passing it on to the police safe in the knowledge that they would do the same, which as we have seen, they did.

Jay listed numerous agencies and committees, employing or involving hundreds of in some case highly paid staff, charged with protecting children from sexual abuse. Even the official Rotherham child care data showed cases loads of sexual abused children running into hundreds. Yet these agencies not only failed to protect them from such abuse but, as we have seen, actively and knowingly facilitated it. For example, in 2014 (that, is, three years after the publication of Norfolk's articles), with Rotherham's rape industry running at full steam, police activity in this area amounted to one prosecution and zero cautions. The number of rapes ran into the tens of thousands.

The final House of Commons Home Affairs Selected Committee report on its investigation into the Rotherham rape industry described the response of public officials to accusations made by its victims. They had, 'in a chilling confirmation of the abusers' blackmail and threats, dismissed the victims – some as young as 12 - as "prostitutes". One care [sic] professional described a girl, 13, as "sexualized" and "dangerous"...she was "glowing with hormones, very confident about her body's power and movement"...She "played the game well" and was, he claimed, a danger "to male members of staff."'. It reads like soft porn, but the words are those of a, quote, 'care professional'. The report continues: 'He was describing a girl who was 11 when she fell victim to men who for three years subjected her to relentless sexual barbarity.'

In its section devoted to the role of the Rotherham police, the Casey Report highlighted what it called their 'phenomenally low conviction rate' of sexual abusers of children. Their explanation always was, 'we are on to it, don't talk about it because we don't want the perpetrators finding out about our operations.' We have seen what some of these 'operations' amounted to... arresting the victims and their fathers. Casey concluded that 'there seemed [sic] to be lawlessness in relation to CSE [child sexual exploitation] in Rotherham. Perpetrators seemed [sic] to face no consequences. Nor were their activities disrupted...There were numerous occasions in which girls were not believed. They were threatened with [the offence of] wasting police time, they were told they had consented to sex [nevertheless, still a crime] and on one occasion, they were arrested at the scene of the crime, rather than the perpetrators.' In a word, collusion with rape, collusion in some cases with one of the most serious crimes on the statute book, sexual activity, consensual or otherwise, with a child under the age of 13, which, I repeat, carries a maximum sentence of 15 years, to which I would add castration without anesthetic. And I also repeat, it was a collusion *ordered by the Home Office*. In addition to 'normal' sexual abuse, girls were subjected to 'rape with a broken bottle' and 'ordered to kiss perpetrators' feet at gun point.'

As in Manchester, girls in care were routinely collected at hostels run by Thacker's Children's Services (sic). A girl referred to as 'X' 'was terrified when she was in the hostel. 'She got a text saying that if she didn't come out [to be gang raped] they'd shoot her.' When police were informed, their response was to say, 'why doesn't she switch her phone off?' Death threats with guns... under-age rape?... none of our business. Casey lists numerous similar instances of when accounts of the most appalling sexual intimidation and abuse by Muslim men (and

in one case, a woman) inflicted on under-aged girls were either not believed or not taken seriously, in every case, resulting in no action being taken.

Norfolk's investigations, and Peter McLoughlin's, book, *Easy Meat*, (the only study of the subject, so far as I am aware, that does not use the 'Asian' slur to identify Muslim rapists) established beyond any doubt that social services and police complicity in the Muslim rape industry extended well beyond Rotherham and the South Yorkshire Police Authority. Norfolk found evidence that Bradford, with its far larger Muslim 'community' than Rotherham's (31%, the highest of any city in the UK, compared to Rotherham's 2%) had a thriving Muslim rape industry as far back as 1991, though it took more than 20 years before any legal action was taken against it. (see above) Bradford West, with a Muslim majority, is the seat of the fanatically anti-Israel Labour MP Naz Shah, suspended for approving an anti-Semitic tweet in 2017, and who unlike Labour MP Sarah Champion, who paid a political price for speaking out against Muslim sexual abuse of young girls in her Rotherham constituency, preferred to keep a lid on the whole sordid business, as was revealed when she endorsed the spoof tweet cited at the beginning of this chapter. Corbyn rewarded her with the post of shadow minister for 'women and equalities,' and Starmer, no less laughably, that of 'community cohesion'.

Incredible as it may seem, institutional collusion in the Muslim rape industry extended beyond the police and social service agencies to the criminal Justice system, with its point-blank refusals to take up cases for which the evidence, including one that provided DNA samples taken from a raped child's underwear, was overwhelming. Casey refers to the 'undoubted difficulties [sic] around getting CSE cases into court with the Crown Prosecution Service.' Norfolk gives examples of this 'difficulty', as here: 'A girl's mother copied the names, numbers and text messages of 177 [yes, 177] Asian [sic] men, including [those of] a police officer, from her daughter's mobile phone after the 13-year-old went missing for five days. Police said that using the information as evidence would infringe the girl's and the men's human rights.' This obviously outweighed the right of a child not to be raped.

Even on the rare occasions when Muslims charged with sex offences against children went to trial, their sentences could be ludicrously mild, as in the following case of a 12-year-old girl being subjected to an unbroken sequence of three separate rape sessions by nine savages in little more than 24 hours. After being abducted off the street and then raped by three men, she was thrown out of their moving car. A man she asked for help invited her into his home, and then raped her. While he was on the phone inviting his friends to come round and rape her, she escaped. A taxi pulled up. The driver offered to take her to the local police station. Instead, he took her to his house and locked her in a room. Five men arrived to rape her by turns over a period of nearly 24 hours. The man who organised this mass rape served half of a six-year jail sentence, the maximum possible reduction. None of the five rapists was prosecuted. Just imagine what the sentence(s) would have been if the girl was a 12-year-old Muslim, and her abductors and rapists were infidels.

So here we have collusion in Muslim child sexual exploitation, conducted over decades on a massive or, to quote again the Jay Report, 'industrial' scale, by public institutions charged with upholding the law and protecting vulnerable children from abuse, and not so much as a whisper of protest from feminists and

their leftist allies against the crimes these institutions facilitated. Yes, the Socialist Workers Party did hold a demonstration in Rotherham, and had Islam not been the main factor in the equation, it would have been against the sexual abuse of working-class girls and rampant misogyny on the part of the police and a corrupt Labour council. But Islam was, so the SWP demo was not against child rape, but racism and Islamophobia.

Finally, compounding this scandal, to date, no one responsible for these proven gross derelictions of duty (and worse) has been the subject of criminal proceedings. I leave it to the reader to speculate as to why this might be the case.

Please remember Charlene Downes and Laura Wilson, victims of Islamic theology and British political correctness.

Footnotes

In August 2022, it was announced that Rotherham had been nominated as the host of the UK's first Children's Capital of Culture. An excellent choice, if I may so. The dominant culture experienced by the town's most vulnerable children for at least the previous four decades had been that of Islam, with Muslim men raping, on an 'industrial scale', and with the connivance of elected politicians, council officials, social workers and police, well over a thousand schoolgirls, some as young as eleven years of age. I therefore propose that to inaugurate the festivities, the victims of the town's rape industry should parade through the town wearing burkas to conceal their identity, each carrying a large poster with the name and photo of one the 36 men and two women convicted of their abuse, or a name and photo of a public official who presided over it.

On April 6, 2023, the Labour Party launched a vicious personal attack on Tory Prime Minister Rishi Sunak, tweeting the accusation that he did not think child sex abusers should be jailed. This was after a statement days earlier by Sunak that he intended to crack down on grooming gangs. Labour's claim was based on the record of sentences handed out to those convicted of sex offences against children since the Tories took office in 2010, ignoring the fact that the Muslim rape industry had been operating unhindered throughout the previous four Labour administrations of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown. And in fairness, it should be pointed out that Sunak was first elected an MP in 2015, and first appointed to the cabinet, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 2020, this not being an office that has any bearing on sentencing policy. But this was not all. As seen above, Labour's record on this issue was appalling, as demonstrated by the already cited Home Office instruction of 2008 to police authorities in England and Wales not to take criminal proceedings against Muslim grooming and rape gangs, and as we have seen, Labour councils ignoring, and in some cases, colluding in and in individual cases, even participating in the Muslim rape industry.

When criticised for what many, including prominent members of his own party, saw as a tasteless political tactic, Starmer made no apology. In fact, he made it clear there would be more of the same in the lead-up to the council elections due to be held the next month. Starmer had accused Sunak for alleged policy failings he was in no sense personally responsible for. Some suggested the

same could have been said for Starmer. He was appointed Director of Public Prosecutions in July 2008, the same year a Labour Home Office issued the above cited instruction to police, and remained in that office to November 2013, during which time he attended 21 meetings of the Sentencing Council. Agenda item number seven concerned sexual offences against children. The Council recommended that not all convictions for such offences should automatically result in a prison sentence. This seems to me to be a reasonable policy. So why the accusation against Sunak? And in fairness to Starmer, the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee, in the above cited investigation into issues surrounding the Muslim rape industry, commended him for having ‘striven to improve the treatment of victims of sexual assault within the criminal justice system throughout his term as Director of Public Prosecutions...His response should be a model to the other agencies involved in talking localized grooming.’ Why then sully that reputation by sanctioning, as he surely must have, the slur against Sunak?

